

(3.)
REMARKS

ON A

S

TREATISE

Entituled,

*A Plain ACCOUNT of the Nature,
End and Use of the Sacrament of the LORD'S-
SUPPER: In which all the Texts in the New
Testament which relate to it, are produc'd
and explain'd, and the whole Doctrine about
it is drawn from them Alone.*

Sectemur mediam sanamque rationem, & de sacramentis honorificè sentiamus nequaquam putantes, ea res esse omnino vacuas spiritualium bonorum. Pet. Mart. 1 Cor. Cap. 10.

Inutilis est ceremonia, nisi fides accedat que verè statuat hic offerri remissionem peccatorum. Apol. August.

By CONYERS PLACE.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the Oxford-Arms
in Warwick-Lane. MDCCLXXXV.

(Price Two Shillings.)

Value





REMARKS

On a TREATISE, &c.

THE present great Neglect of the important Duty of receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, one of the two *generally Necessaries to Salvation, ordained by Christ himself*, is a scandalous and deplorable Instance of the Decay of Christian Piety amongst us; and may more justly be looked upon as the Cause, rather than Effect of that thorough Dissolution, both in Principle and Practice, that reigns uncontrollable; the generality of the Inhabitants in Country Parishes, living and dying without discharging that Duty in defiance to Scripture, the Churches Canon, and her Exhortations.

Had the Design of this Treatise upon the Sacrament, been (as one well might have hoped, from so great a Man and eminent a Bishop as the Author is said to be) to remedy this so epidemical and crying Evil; by his so *Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament, drawn from Texts of Scripture alone*, and to clear the Way to

the Lord's Table, by removing the Impediments and Causes of its being so shamefully and scandalously forsaken by those whose Profession obliges them to attend it; and by inculcating the Necessity of the Duty, and the Danger of neglecting it; the little or no Danger from its honest discharge; the *great Privileges and Benefits* attending and consequent upon it; and hereby have contributed to the Reformation of this Irreligion, by making the common Body of our People more carefully and conscientiously Attendants on this divine Ordinance; as it had been a seasonable and good Work, so could it not have fail'd of considerable Success, from a Head and Pen of such superior Talents, as have shewed us in this, and other Instances, how well they have made even wrong things to look.

But instead of the promised *Plain Account of the Sacrament, drawn from Scripture alone*, we have an intricate Account, turning chiefly upon the Sense and Construction of *Greek Words*, the Faultiness of our authorized Translations, and the various Readings of the Original, and the uncertain Issue of the Author's Criticisms, Comments, and Paraphrases; which few, or none of those *ignorant and unlearned Christians*, for whose Instruction he writes, are capable of judging, whether they are right or wrong. And his Lordship himself is so hard put to it, to bring the Doctrines and Language of our Church in her Offices and Catechism, to speak in his Favour, or reconcilably to his Doctrine, that were what he does, done by an Author to whom less Respect was due, I should think it no breach of good Manners to call it trifling or shuffling; where the Subject is highly improper for it, and which want charitable construction very much.

The

The 27th *Homily* of our Church, so full of Expressions sounding directly contrary to his Lordship's Doctrine, and that wants adapting to it, his Lordship has quite forgot; and the 25th Article also of the Church, he seems to have despair'd of, for without attempting to adapt it, he lets it alone, as a Reprobate that was intractable. But his Lordship methinks should have offer'd at some Reconciliation of it to his Doctrine; because it is hard that the Law should oblige his Lordship to make young Men assent to, and subscribe to the absolute Truth of an Article, whom by this Treatise he may have convinced of its being false. For though his Lordship by Paraphrases and Explications, and Reconcilements of it to his Doctrine, best known to himself, may have given ease to his own Conscience; yet for the sake of young Men, who are less expert Casuists, he should have pointed out to them some of his *may-be's*, by which they might assent to the truth of that Article, and his Lordship's Doctrine also of no *Benefits* being annexed to the Lord's Supper, without entangling their Consciences.

In my poor Opinion, I think his Lordship had much better have let quite alone the Churches Offices, as well as the few Fathers and other Authorities that he calls in; than just to touch them as he does, like a pair of hot Tongs; as well knowing there was nothing for him there; and to have stuck strictly to the Letter of his Title Page, and made the best of his Cause in drawing from Texts of Scripture alone; as in truth his not doing so, is going out of his way, and breach of Promise with us, as well as breach of his own Principles. But instead of drawing his Doctrine from Scripture alone, I don't see, but he is glad to draw from any thing that he can lay hold of, to give

give colour to his Doctrine; and as willing as another Man, to get any body to speak a good word for his Notions; notwithstanding the big Words that he gives out to the contrary, of its *little Importance.*

And what he draws from Scripture, is not the willing and genuine Spirit of the Texts, but expressed and wrung out, as with hard squeezing, and no small ado; nor is any of it clear, easy, or sincere; he not producing one single Text for him uncontroverted, but what he is forced by dint of critical Labour to make into Soil, before he can raise Propositions, or gather Fruit from it; but there is not one that can be called *plain* or *clear.* It is a Triumph with him, if contrary to the more general and received Acceptation, he can make a Text bear the Sense and Construction that his Doctrine requires. And especially in the Offices of the Church, it is well if he can bring them so far in sight of his Principles, as to make, by the help of *a strong Figure, a thus it may be said of it; and thus the Lord's Supper may be called; and in this Sense any religious Ceremony may be called; and the Communion may be called, &c.* His reconcilements are such come-offs as these; and Men that are disposed to trifle insincerely with plain Sense, and Propriety of the *Name, Nature and Effects* of the Sacrament, and want Pretences for themselves, by which they may have the Reputation of Churchmen, and qualify themselves for the Advantages the Law of their Country has annexed to being so, *by may be said* not very consistent with Propriety and Christian Simplicity, may hence borrow Patterns, how it may be done; a Use which his Lordship must be very sorry to have this or any of his Labours perverted to, so contrary to their Design.

The

The Neglect of the Duty of receiving the Sacrament, I take to arise from one of these two contrary Causes; either *first*, from Terror; or *2dly*, from Contempt; from, that is, either too high, or too low an Opinion of the Nature, End and Use of the Institution. And in the middle between these two Extremes, the Seat of Virtue, is here that of Truth, and the Doctrine of our Church; and to sail between these two Rocks, so as keeping clear of the one, not to run foul upon the other, is the Difficulty; not to be precipitated by the *ἀμείλια ἀνδορίας*, as they call it; by a Proclivity in our Nature, that carries us too violently from that which we fly from, into the contrary extreme; which has been too generally the unfortunate Event.

First, What keeps many from the Sacrament, is *Terror*, they are scared and frightened from it; the Root of which, I take, in part, to be the absurd and monstrous Doctrine of Transubstantiation. I do not mean the Doctrine itself believed, but its Consequences; for though I take our People to be well cured of, and armed against that Popish Error in particular; yet it had struck such a deep Impression of Dread and Overawedness, that the superstitious Remains which that tremendous Doctrine has left behind it, are not, like several others, so quite worn out, but the Effects of it by the Air of Tradition, hangs still upon and affects diffident and weak Minds; and his Lordship, since it fell in his Way, has done well to advance his new, *short, and plain Argument* against that Doctrine (*Prop. 8.*) *with which alone*, he says, *unlearned Christians may prove the Absurdity and Falshood of it*; and so they may, if those they have to deal withal are as unlearned as themselves; otherwise I must confess, that I do not
see

see that force in it, as to make it advisable to any to trust to that alone; especially since there is no Occasion for it: But as it is not wanted, it may do well enough along with better Company; and I am afraid that there is not so much Demonstration in this Argument, as his Lordship pleases himself withal. And that *doing any Act in Remembrance of any Person, does not necessarily imply his bodily Absence*; nor his bodily Presence inconsistent with Acts of Remembrance of him; but the same very Person may be present, and yet Actions done in Remembrance of him; if the Facts that he is remembered for, were but done in different Time and Place. Don't we commonly commemorate what our Friends and Benefactors have done for us, in Times past, and Places distant, in their Presence? Nay, do not Men solemnly commemorate themselves, doing or suffering Things remarkable? If Christ were to be remembered, abstracted from all Circumstances attending his Person, there might be something in his Lordship's Argument; but the Remembrance of his dying a Sacrifice for us, is a Duty may be discharged even by the Saints in Heaven, that are always in his immediate Presence, and more effectually for his being present, than by us from whom his Body is absent. If Christ were bodily present in an Assembly, could they not, notwithstanding, receive the Sacrament of what he called his Body and Blood, in Pursuance of his Command, in Remembrance of what he did and suffered for them upon the Cross? Was not the Sacrament originally administered by himself, in Remembrance of himself? But of this more hereafter. If the Papists make an Absurdity of this, in making the Sacrament his natural Body, the Absurdity arises from the natural Impossibility of one Body being

being in several distinct Places at one time, and not from the Act of *Remembrance implying his bodily Absence*; which none are so unlearned but perceive the Force of; that the same numerical Body that is here, cannot at the same time be there and every where; the Churches Argument at the End of the Communion Office.

Or 2dly, what scares our People from the holy Sacrament, is partly the Danger of doing it *unworthily*; which some of our Divines more piously than prudently, have possessed Peoples Minds withal, by straining up to too high a Pitch, the Duties of Examination and Preparation; which they make to be too formally tedious and nice and critical and difficult a Task; and partly the Penalty denounced by St. Paul to failure in proper Qualification, viz. *Damnation*; which as in use with us in *English*, sounds dreadfully enough indeed to startle well disposed Persons, and frighten them from venturing too freely on a Duty of that dangerous Experiment; which Expression wants its due softening to be truly and generally better known.

And here the Right Reverend Author has displayed his masterly Talent, in effectually lightning both the Burden of Examination and Preparation, and that also from the Nature of the Danger of the Penalty, and the Fear of running into it, if he has not over-done it; and which is worse, had he not with removing the Danger and Trouble, that kept Men off, removed also, the Invitations and Inducements that draw Men to it; and from a Feast of fat Things, a *Banquet of most heavenly Food, so divine and comfortable a Thing, (Exhort.) instituted and ordained holy Mysteries as Pledges of his Love, to our great and endless Comfort (Office of the Com.)* which one would think
 B should

should speak great Benefits, reduced it to be the most meagre Banquet, that ever under the Name of a *Supper*, God prepared for the Entertainment of Sinners to draw them to Conversion, or of Saints for their Repast. From the Representation of a *Marriage Feast*, a great *Supper*, where *Oxen and Fatlings* are killed, and all Things ready; our Bishop would turn the Exhortation to come if you think fit, to the jejune and barren Duty; but here is nothing for you I assure you; here are no such Bounties or Largeesses, as are fondly imagined to be bestowed; no Privileges, no Benefits, no Advantages, no Grace, no Faith, no Gift of God's Spirit; no Food, no Physick, to cure or strengthen and refresh your Souls; nor any supernatural Favours of any Kind peculiar to it; all which is no better than a *Dream*, which will end in Disappointment when you are waked out of it. But then indeed as there is little to be hoped for, so there is but little to be done; here is only an Act of Memory to be exercised, to think on Christ, and the Work is over; which you may do any where, at any time, as well among yourselves at your Leisure at Home, as at Church. My Lord has made the Way to the Communion Table as easy and safe as Heart can wish; as free to be come at, as if it stood out upon an open Common; but then he has left it empty and unfurnished of what should draw Men to it: Were his moral Virtues left at that Rate, without Rewards on one Side, but not without a frightful Peril denounced on the other, to Failure in Circumstance of Discharge; the Obligations to practise them from the Law of *Religione* and *Fitness*, &c. would bring in but few Customers to exercise them; and I have that high Opinion of his Lordship's worldly Prudence, in such Case, that that single Virtue would prevail
over

over Obligations so far, as to make him excuse himself to the others.

If St. Paul's *inquit* in the Institution, implies a *mandatum*, and as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, lays an Obligation of doing it, as often as solemn and appointed Occasions to do it, offer themselves; as it is a great Reason to make us thank, that our Saviour annexed to it peculiar Benefits, if it were but to balance the Trouble, the Danger, and Difficulties, that might discourage us from the Duty of its Frequency; and to take off the Sense of any of those Benefits, is a greater Discouragement to the enjoined Duty of frequent Discharge, than lightning the Trouble of Preparation, and the Danger of Unworthiness, can make up. For where the Value of the Prizes are more than answerable, the Sense of Difficulties and Dangers in the Means, are drowned in that of the End, which makes them seem light, and gone through with greater Care and Application; and had his Lordship took off, not some, but entirely all, both Trouble and Danger from the Duty of receiving the Sacrament, as he has took from it every Benefit and Privilege in particular, that have been believed to be peculiar to it; yet the Indifference of the Action, and no Hopes of Advantage from it in View, would make the frequent Discharge of it a Burden, tho' charged with none beside. And indeed were any of God's Commands, though attended with neither Danger nor Trouble in their Discharge, stripped of all proposed Advantages, their insipid, and impertinent Innocence, would make frequent Acts of Obedience to them seem a Grievance; and much more, if a heavy Penalty hung over the undue Discharge; and to leave but any Part of the Danger standing from unworthy Partici-

pation, as his Lordship does, and no peculiar Benefit, to weigh against it; to charge it though but with a Sanction of Slight and accidental Punishment, but with no such of Reward, in like manner peculiarly annexed to it, is making it such a forbidding Institution, as is enough to make Men shy and backward to come to it. And Bishop Burnet (*Exp. Art. 28.*) justly here says, *we may well conclude that the good Effects upon the worthy receiving of it, are equal, if not superior to the bad Effects upon the unworthy receiving it; and that the Nourishment which the Bread and Wine give the Body, are answered in the Effects, that the Thing signified by them, has upon the Soul.*

Those who go to the Sacrament, and themselves think, and would persuade others, that there is nothing to be got by the receiving it, are in the right to take care to lose nothing by it. And if our Saviour did not institute it to do them any good, to be sure he did not intend it should do them any harm; so since he has peculiarly annexed no spiritual Benefits to it, it would be hard on its Account to lose those temporal ones which the Civil Power has annexed to it. His Lordship's Doctrine leaves it such an unpromising Piece of Service, that few would care to meddle with, more than need must; run the Risque of being damned, if they received it unworthily, and have no Promise of good from it, but their Labour for their Pains, though they did it worthily. A Sanction of Punishment annexed on one hand, and none of Reward on the other, looks like the Act of a Legislator, that would tempt his Subjects to Disobedience. It is a Question, who go to it more unworthily, those who go with no Hopes of Benefit from it, by the *strengthening and refreshing of their Souls*, without any worldly Advan-

Advantage; or those who go with those same Sentiments, as a legal Qualification for some good Place, for the strengthening and refreshing of their Bodies, by the Increase of worldly Interest; those who stand the Chance of the Penalty, being sure of something, or those who stand the same Chance from the same unworthy Thoughts of it, for nothing.

A second Cause of the Duty of the Lord's Supper being neglected, is *Contempt*; which arises from several Causes; as from Atheism not formal and firm Scheme, so much as from a thoughtless Prophaneness, and rustical Stupidity; a barbarous and heathenish Habit of Irreligion, contracted by an immersedness in sensualities and worldly Cares; a State that Men falling into, live on, forgetful of God and Religion: Spiritual Drones and Sluggards, that will not be at the Pains of discharging the Duties of Religion. Or chiefly from *Infidelity*; founded on Deism, and what they call natural Religion; teaching Men to despise Revelation, but particularly its positive Duties called; and running down the Sacraments especially to the lowest Degree; calling the Lord's Supper a *Rite*, as a Name which they think exposes it as contemptible; resolving all Religion into their Morality, into Virtues and Vices, not exercised as God's Commands, but from higher Obligations, as they pretend, on Nature's foot, arising from their I know not what, *Reason and Nature of things*; a *System* of moral Duties, whose *practical Excellencies are the true Heights and exalted Accomplishments of a Christian Life* (p. 156.). It is in short, the modish, but false Distinction of religious Duties, into moral and positive; the extolling to the Skies those of the former Kind, and depressing those of the latter; which almost follows

follows of Course, as naturally as the lifting up one Scale, depresses the other. It is the Effects and Influences of this deistical Doctrine and Distinction, that has insensibly betrayed the Christian Faith in the Minds of our People; a Poison that has been working this Century past, but secretly, and in the Dark; till now of late, conceited of its Strength, and Interest, it has broken out in open Attack upon the Christian Revelation; mixed itself with Sermons and Books of Religion, gain'd itself an Interest in those, whose solemnest Obligations added to their Christian Profession, made it their Duty to oppose it; in-somuch, that if Fame be not a great Lyar, the Right Reverend Author of this Treatise himself, in some or all the Cathedrals where he has presided, might have heard the *Religion of Nature* preached up, instead of the Religion of Christ; seen those strutting under Scarves and Lawn, and seated in Stalls, and presiding over the Administration of those Sacraments and Christian Services and Ordinances, which they were openly attempting to vilify and destroy; exercising that ecclesiastical Authority and Jurisdiction, which they were enervating and exposing as contemptible; and from Distemper endeavouring to be thought Constitution, making *Shipwreck* of Faith, Creeds, and every Christian Grace; Terms they seem religiously to abstain from, seldom dropping from their Mouths in Sermons, or their Pens in their religious Treatises. His Lordship knows, that this cried up Religion of Nature, is a Religion that is not drawn from *express Texts of Scripture alone*, a Religion that our Saviour is silent about; his Apostles Strangers to; and the Scriptures New and Old ignorant of. From what Texts does it appear that Christ is only the *reviver* of

of *this purest Religion*, the repairer and mender only of its decays? From what Texts is it drawn, that the Christian Sacraments, and the Institutes of Christ, are Duties less excellent and necessary to human Salvation, than those of this never heard of Religion till of late? Or that the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit, are not equal in value to moral Virtues; that these must be exalted above them, and distinguished from them by Names of Superiority: It is possessing Mens Minds with Inculcations, that if they are but good moral Men, live honestly, hurt no body, give every Man his civil due; as for the Sacraments and Christian Ordinances, they are not so necessary, they need not trouble their Heads much about them; they are *Positives, Indifferents* in themselves, which if they may be imposed and complied withal, yet signify little, whether they carefully attend their discharge or no, having no Advantages particularly annexed to them. But for moral Virtue, that's all in all, though not of God's making so; but from *the Nature and Reason of things*, not his determination; *that is the Substantial*, and for the rest, there is not much in it whether they do it or let it alone; the most extravagant Rant of this kind, we have in Dr. Clark, (*Evid. of Nat. and Revel. Relig.*) I hope a youthful folly from Imprudence, rather than ill Design in that great Man, because so inconsistent with Christianity.

As his Lordship is throughly sensible of this Danger from the Infidel quarter, and of the notorious and insolent Assaults that have been made upon the Christian Religion and Revelation; so I wish that his Lordship had express'd as much care and concern in this Treatise; whilst he is reforming the dangerous Errors and Superstitions of our Church,

Church, by having too high thoughts of the Holy Sacrament, and expecting more good from it than Christ *put into it*; which is little or nothing at all; to have guarded against the *Contempt* of it, from the Infidel extremes; since his Subject of declaring its *Nature* and *Use*, so fairly led him to do this, and threw it so full in his way, that he could not slip it over without notice, and note of Disapprobation. And since I am not aware, that his Lordship has ever distinguished himself at any time in defence of the Christian Sacraments, or Revelation; but the World on the other Hand, his Lordship must be sensible, has been so uncharitable, as to sully his episcopal Character, as well from the Conduct of his Life as Writings, with Misconstructions of his favouring and patronizing those Infidel Notions that are now endangering Christianity, and bring *Contempt*, and thereby neglect upon the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Doctrine of which he is setting in a right Light. His Lordship indeed gives us to understand, that the great End in view in his Writing this Treatise, was to defeat the pernicious Designs of Infidels; but I must own the Method he takes is so indirect, that I should not have found it out, had he not told us so.

(Preface p. 8.) *The best Preservative against the chief Attempts of Unbelievers, I am persuaded, is to shew the Religion of Christ to the World as he left it; — nor can I think any time more truly seasonable to guard against Superstition of any sort, than when Infidelity is making efforts; which is ever seen to draw its main Strength from the Extravagancies and Weaknesses of Christians, and not from the Declarations of Christ to his Apostles.*

The

The *chief Attempts of Unbelievers* we know, and see, are to destroy divine Revelation.

The Doctrines and Precepts of which, delivered by Christ and his Apostles, is, I suppose, what his Lordship means by *Religion, as Christ left it*; and their true sense and meaning.

The World to whom this Religion is to be shewn, must be believing and professing Christians; because it is a *Preservative* for them; who are to shew it to one another. But in case there should be a Doubt which is this divine Revelation, or about any part of it; his Lordship should have told us, who is to judge and determine, and satisfy Men which are the Divine Records, and which the original Words of them; and that this is the *Church, that is witness and keeper of holy Writ.* (Art. 20.) And suppose there is further again a doubt of the Sense and Construction of these Words, People must know, who either by divine Appointment, or so far as there is not that Appointment, who by their own Choice and Appointment, they are to be concluded by; and this it is evident each particular Church is to its Members; so far as its determinations go, and so long as themselves chuse to be so: These things agreed upon; then indeed the Office of *Showers* comes in. And thus his Lordship, whom I highly reverence for the Dignity of his high Station, and episcopal Character, is a regular and eminent *Shower of the Religion of Christ to the World as he left it*, established and exemplified, in the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *England*, agreed to by himself, to the Members of that Church; who have agreed to, and accepted it accordingly as such; and to *show Religion as Christ left it*, appearing in and through the Doctrines of the Church to its Members, may, as
C his

his Lordship is persuaded, be the best Preservative against the chief Attempts of Unbelievers. *The Religion of Christ as he left it*, absolutely so, are the Scriptures; the Churches determination of the Scriptures, so far as they go, are Christ's Religion, *ex hypothesi*, as so admitted and agreed to by its Members. But neither his Lordship, nor any other particular Person, ought to make himself *Show* general to these Members, of Christ's Religion, so far as to lay before them his Account of the Lord's Supper, or any other Doctrine drawn from Scripture, as the immediate Rule for the Members to believe and walk by; or otherwise, than in Subordination and presumed Conformity to the Determinations of the Church; much less to brand with the Name of *Superstition*, *Weakness*, and *Extravagance*, all Senses of the Terms of Institution of the Lord's Supper, or other Doctrines, but those he thinks fit to affix to them, or which are not suitable to his Paraphrases and Expositions; or condemn all those, who understand and practise the Churches Doctrine, of that divine Ordinance, unsuitably to his low taste of it; for this is not being a Doer of the Duties of Christ's Religion, but a Judge, and acting the Part that only belongs to the Head and whole Legislative of the religious Establishment.

To guard against *Superstition*, is seasonable at all Times, and so is it to guard against *Infidelity* too! And if it is more seasonable to guard against *Superstition* than ordinary, *when Infidelity is making its Efforts*; by the same Logick, it is more seasonable also to guard against *Infidelity*, when *Superstition and Popery* is making its Efforts; which draws as much Strength from *Infidelity*, as *Infidelity* does from *Superstition*; for I am persuaded that our Free Thinkers, Deists, and Religion of Nature

ture Men, have done more Service to Popery, than Priests and Jesuits do by their Conversions. And my Lord of *W——* himself, by this so seasonable Treatise of his, and some of his other Works, whilst he is labouring to reform the moderate Doctrines of ours and other Protestant Churches concerning the Sacrament, by too much debasing of it, may, to his great Trouble, be a double Contributor to the Increase of the Number, both of Papists and Infidels amongst us, by driving Persons scandalized from the middle way into each Extreme, and make more Proselytes to the two Extremes, than to his own Notions. If Infidelity arose from Superstition, than the more Superstitious, the more Infidels; then there would be more Infidels under Popery, than Protestantism; but there does not appear, at present, to be so many open and professed ones; then we should have fewer Infidels amongst us, now we are reformed, than before; but his Lordship will hardly find such Efforts against Christianity, under the grossest Superstitions of Popery, as are now amongst us; and the Growth of our Infidelity is so much the more unnatural, as it is in a Soil that does not abound with that from which, his Lordship says, it draws its main Strength. His Lordship indeed tells us of several *Sorts of Superstition*, that we are to guard against; it would have been kind in his Lordship to have told us not only which those Sorts are, but which are the very Superstitions of each Sort, that we might the better guard against them; I hope his Lordship does not mean any in the Church of *England* (though 'tis true, the Errors he impugns are chiefly those, unless Transubstantiation.) For though the Hopes and Belief of receiving Benefits from the Sacrament, be supposed to be ill grounded,

yet I hope his Lordship will think it enough to have them some of his *Weaknesses* and *Extravagancies* only, without ranking them with Superstitions; at least till they are clearly disproved. And why must we only guard against Superstition, and through that Indirection, against Infidelity? Are there to be no *Defenders of the Faith*? Why may we not *contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints*? Are Atheists and Infidels so well fortified, that there is no making Impression upon them with rational Weapons? Have not Infidels their *Weaknesses* and *Extravagances*, as well as Christians, from which Christians may draw Strength against them? Why does not his Lordship at our Head, as directly attack Infidelity as it does us? And point some of his Artillery against them, and face them boldly and strenuously? Who are we afraid of disobliging, or what are we ashamed of? I wish I could see his Lordship, Christian Hero like, with the *Shield of Faith* in his Hand, with which the Worthies of old did such Wonders, lead us on against the Armies of these Aliens, and roundly charge these Deists, and Religion of Nature Men home; and let them and the World see, how much they are mistaken in their Man, and how far he is from having that Inclination to their Principles, that enviously and maliciously, they have thrown out Insinuations to credit their Cause, of his having; bespattering his great Name with Calumnies equal to the grossest Immoralities to a Christian Bishop. I readily agree with his Lordship, *that it ought to be far from the Thoughts of every Christian to lessen any Privilege, or undervalue any Promises annexed by Christ to any Duty or Institution of his Religion* (Pref. p. 5.) *and that is a Fault to which no Christian can have the least Temptation, &c.* But lest this should be saying

saying hard Things of himself, he not very inconsistently in the same Breath unsays it again, and tells us, that this *inexcusable Fault*, that *ought to be far from the Thoughts of every Christian*, that *wilfully to attempt it* destroys the Christian Character; *this I think may with Truth be said, that an Error of this Sort, does not really hurt any Christian*; (Pref. p. 5.) And accordingly he encourages Men by Reasons added to his Example, to vilify, rather than magnify, divine Institutions; though the Generality of Mankind will hardly be convinced, but exalting, rather than debasing, God's Institutions, is the more rational and safer Side to err upon.

God will certainly perform, his Lordship says, *what he has promised to every one who partakes of the Lord's Supper worthily*. But what should he perform, when his Lordship contends for his promising nothing at all? If in this, as in other Cases, it will be to every Receiver according to his Faith, his Lordship, &c. can come in but for little Share of good, whatever they may escape receiving the other way. But what indeed may not Men with great Reason hope, though no express Promise is made for it, from such an Institution, of such an Institutor, so solemn, expressed in Terms so full of Wonder and Magnificence, so awful in every Circumstance, and commanding Assurances, of carrying more in it relating to us, than ever natural Action did before. Figurative Expressions ought to be construed in proportion to the Height and Dignity of the Resemblances made use of; which in this Case are such, that nothing but straining them up to the Nonsense and Absurdity of Transubstantiation, can be thought magnifying them; and to sink them down to Matter of small, or low Importance, is to

I

charge

charge both the Institutor, and his Apostles, with Impropriety, and a dangerous Choice of Terms, that could not but mislead us. The Words themselves promise every Thing that is great and good; and want no Promises to heighten our Expectations of spiritual Advantages from the Duty discharged; to insist upon which, is an unworthy Reflexion upon them, and a Reproach to him that is their Author.

His Lordship's Hypothesis is; *That an Account of the Nature, and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ought to be drawn from the Texts of the New Testament relating to it (which is the right Way of examining into its Nature and Extent,) — And the New Testament alone to be depended on, from which we ought with the greatest Care and Honesty, to take all our Notions of this Duty.*

Thus far we set out together, all agreed; but how close his Lordship keeps to this Hypothesis, and the Method promised in his Title Page; and how successfully and consistently with himself he prosecutes it; the Reader will presently find.

P R O P. I.

The partaking of the Lord's Supper, is not a Duty of itself; or a Duty apparent to us from the Nature of Things; but a Duty made such to Christians by the positive Institution of Jesus Christ.

R E M. His Lordship is resolved to make sure Work, and to build his Doctrine upon a Rock, though 'tis of his own making: For this Foundation of his, however deep and strong, yet is Breach of Covenant with us; for his Lordship will not pretend, I believe, that the Distinction of Christian Duties, into positive, and those from
the

the Nature of Things, is an *Account of the Nature of the Sacrament, drawn from Texts of the new or old Testament*, that alone ought to be depended upon.

For my own Part I know no Duty in the Christian Religion, but what is made so by positive Institution; if there is, it is not properly a Christian Duty; nor do I know of any Duty or Obligation, either in the Christian Religion, or any Religion, or out of it, but what is from positive Institution.

Well, but let it be a *Duty made such to Christians by the positive Institution of Christ*: Why must it be ever the worse for that, because it is of his making? Oh! it must to be sure, says his Lordship; a Duty of Nature's making, *from the Nature and Reason of things*, one good substantial moral Duty, is worth two of God's making at any time. Well, let this too go as his Lordship would have it for the present; that there are but two sorts of Duties, a right, and a wrong that have nothing good in them; and the Lord's Supper is of this wrong sort; but is this comparative excellence of a moral Duty beyond the Lord's Supper, drawn from Texts of Scripture still? Or is his Lordship not come to his Business yet, and this is to go by way of Preliminary? And what are we to suppose that his Lordship gains to his Doctrine by the Sacrament not being of the better sort of Duties, but a command of Christ's only? Oh! the Logick is plain: Would Christ do you think annex any top Benefits to a trifling Duty of the worst sort? And why not? Virtues they tell us are their own Reward; and positive Duties, being such as they would have them, want Rewards annex'd most of all, according to themselves.

P R O P. II.

All positive Duties, or Duties made such by Institution alone, depend entirely upon the Will and Declaration of the Person that institutes or ordains them, with respect to the real Design and End of them, and consequently to the due Manner of performing them.

REM. All Duties are positive, so all depend as he says on the Will and Declaration of the Instructor; and I defy his Lordship, or any one else, to prove there is such a Distinction, not by Texts of Scripture only, as he ought to do it, but by Reason; or to instance in one single Duty, in natural, religious, or civil Life, that is not from divine, or human Determination.

How few of the common Body of Christians, to instruct whom he writes this Treatise, know what the Terms of this Distinction *moral* and *positive* mean? How many that know, that do not allow of it? Is this *laying down Things in so plain and intelligible a Manner, that every Christian capable of thinking at all upon the Subject, may immediately see whether it conveys to him the true Notions of this Duty? Is this giving us his Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament from Texts of the New Testament, drawn from them alone; which alone we ought to depend upon?* Is there one Word in the New Testament of the positive Nature of this Duty, and its Distinction from those from the Nature of Things? Or so much as those Names there, or any thing answerable to them? His leading poor People a Jaunt here, out of all Scripture Road, into his new Philosophy, to build upon his Scheme, is running quite from his proposed Method, of drawing from *Scripture alone*, into the midst of speculative and metaphysical Points; the

the Nature, Reason, and Differences of things, and all the airy trumpery that our Deists are building their religious Castles in the Air upon; where few can follow them, and few of those that do, return from their Travels wiser or better Christians; Is this, I say, making the Nature of the Sacrament plain from Scripture? How far some may have Recourse to Invention, I know not, to explain the Nature of the Sacrament; but his Lordship's Foundation hitherto seems to be all of that sort.

P R O P. III.

It is plain therefore, that the Nature, the Design, the due Manner of Partaking of the Lord's Supper, must of necessity depend on what Jesus Christ, who instituted it, has declared about it.

REM. There is no doubt of it; since all Duties of this sort (and he might put in of any other sort) cannot be known, but from the Will of those that appoint them; and yet it is plain, that his Lordship has taken upon him already to declare a good deal about the Nature of it, before he permits it to come to Christ or his Apostles turn to declare any thing about it, or their being yet consulted; so that by his own Rule we yet know nothing of the Matter; and all that has been yet said about it, goes for nothing.

P R O P. IV.

It cannot be doubted, that he himself sufficiently declared, to his first, and immediate Followers, the whole of what he designed should be understood by it,

D

or

or implied in it, ——— declared his mind about it fully and plainly.

R E M. No doubt (though his Lordship does not draw it from Scripture) but Christ sufficiently declared not only this, but every other necessary and important Duty, for the Reason is the same for all, as for this; call them positive or moral; as well to make them Duties, as for the right understanding of them made; the same divine Constitution, that made the ritual and ceremonial Parts of the Law to be religious Duties to the *Jews*, made the moral also to be so; and both were declared with equal Sufficiency; yet we find that those which are called moral, even the chief of them, were worse understood than the positive called; and had not our Saviour better explain'd the moral Duties of the Law, *viz.* the 5th, 6th, 7th Commandments, and his Apostles after him; their apparency from the *Reason* and *Nature of things*, to direct and help Men to understand what they contain'd, would have left us to this Day, as they were to the *Jews*, worse understood, than those founded on the Institutor's Will only, which they call Positive.

But though Duties are never so sufficiently declared at first to the Persons to whom they were immediately given out, yet that Sufficiency cannot hold to future Generations, without a Continuation and Repetition of the Revelation, without the same natural Helps and Means that assure, as well the Declarations themselves being made, as the Sense of them, to absent Persons, or to them, who though present, understood not the Language the Revelation or Declaration was made in. So that though the original Declaration was never so sufficient in itself, and on God's part, yet it cannot be so now to us, farther and otherwise, than by

compliance with those Means and Conditions, by which we assure ourselves, as well of the Declarations being made, as to Fact, as of their Sense in all other cases; of the Fact absolutely as to all; as to Sense, altogether as to some only, and in great measure as to all; which Means and Condition is relying on the Testimonies of others; traditionally chained to each other, from the Declarer down to us; as to the Truth and Certainty of the Declaration itself being made; and on the Integrity of such others, as we chuse and agree to trust, as to the Sense of the Declaration; its *Nature, End, and Use*; and especially if there appear an Appointment of Witnesses and Guardians to secure the one to us; and of official Interpreters to lay before the less capable the Sense, as to the other. No original Declaration, however in itself plain, and full, when given out, can, without a heap of Miracles, do more than this comes to to future Generations; let the Institution be what they call Moral or Positive, which makes no difference.

P R O P. V.

It is of small Importance therefore to Christians, to know what the many Writers upon this Subject, since the Time of the Evangelists and Apostles, have affirmed; much less can it be the Duty of Christians to be guided by what any Persons by their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations, may teach concerning this Duty.

R E M. Our Author is not yet quite come to his Business; for be this and the foregoing Propositions true or false; yet neither that Truth, nor any part of it, is drawn from Texts of Scripture alone; and this neither from Scripture or Reason: that

all that has been writ upon the Subject since the Apostles Time, is of small Importance.

However, it may be proper for those to cry down all Authority, who have little or none of it on their Side. And his Lordship himself will not break in upon his own Proposition, by pleading the Benefit of any Authority, I hope, either in this Treatise or its Defence, but keep to his Text; having so little of it to lead him out of his way.

Let the Nature of a Duty be what it will, call it moral or positive, it is impossible to come at the understanding of it, but by the same way by which Men understand every thing else that has been spoken by any body a great while ago; unless the Author can prove from Scripture, that there is a particular Rule given for understanding it, different from all others; Men that understand the Originals, may form Notions of the Passages of Scripture for themselves, but not by the way the Bishop prescribes, by not minding what any Body has writ or said upon the Subject, but by the same Laws of Criticism, by which they determine the Sense of Passages in any other Authors; by consulting Lexicons, and Men of Skill, especially those nearer the Fountain Head; that have left in writing their Sense of the Nature of the Duty signified, and how it has been understood and practised by those whom it highly concerned to pursue the Intent of the Institutor: But for the common Body of the unlearned and unskilful, as they must entirely depend on the Authority of Testimony and Tradition, written and unwritten, for the Truth, both of the Fact itself, and all its Circumstances; handing it down from Generation to Generation; so to them its Sense must also entirely depend on the same Testimony;

Testimony; without immediate Recourse to Christ himself, or the first Relators from him, who speak to them in an unknown Tongue; and what is to be done in that Case, *St. Paul* tells us; *If any Man speak in an unknown Tongue let one interpret,* (1 Cor. xiv.) the Choice of which Interpreter, is all that by the Nature of the Thing they have to depend upon; and must found their Faith upon it, and not upon their own immediate Knowledge. Those whose Notions and Representations of the Mind of Christ, they think the justest, to prefer those, to discharge the Duty upon, to those of others, that are altogether absurd or less probable; or whom they have Reason to suspect, that Prejudice and Partiality may have had some Share in their determining the Exposition; to prefer the Judgment of Bodies to that of single Men; that of those whom they depend upon for the Translation and Interpretation, not only of what relates to the Sacrament, but of the whole Scriptures, into the Tongue they understand; that of those who are embarked with them in the same common Bottom, with Regard both to Religion and civil Interest; that are clear of having all separate Views to themselves, different from that of their whole Country's Welfare, of those to whose Determinations of Christ's revealed Will, they have trusted themselves in all other Particulars, both of Faith and Worship, &c. To put it into such Mens Heads *that it is of small Importance to know what Writers upon this Subject since the Apostles Time have affirmed; what primitive and uncorrupt Churches have professed, or how they have practised the Duty of the Sacrament; what Councils charged with no Errors, and received by the Community they are Members of, have decreed; or what Fathers* learned,

learned, early and orthodox, have delivered to us, and practised; what all present Protestant Bodies profess and practise; is to strike from under such Men the immediate Foundation of Faith, and sink them of course into Infidelity. His Lordship indeed rightly observes, that *it cannot be the Duty of Christians to be guided by what any Persons by their own Authority, or from their own Inventions, may teach concerning this Duty.* But then he fights no Adversaries; for I am not aware of any Instances of Persons who have so *taught* or *guided* by Authority founded on themselves; or challenged Obedience, as Duty, on any other Terms, than as their Authority was that of Christ. All guide and teach as his Lordship *has endeavoured to guide by Directions, &c.* (p. 5.) as from Christ and his Apostles; as his Lordship does; and all that the common Body of Christians have to do, is to believe such, of all these different *Guides* and *Teachers*, which they think to be in the right.

But *the Reason is plain*, his Lordship says, *because no one can be a Judge but Christ himself, what he designed should be contained in the Institution; and being supposed not to have spoken his Mind plainly about it, it is impossible that any other Person, (to whom the Institutor himself never revealed his Design,) should make up that Defect.* I hope his Lordship does not make himself an Exception from his own Rules; that if it is of *small Importance to Christians to know what Writers since the time of the Apostles have affirmed of this Duty; that it is of as small, to know what his Lordship says about it; if they are not to be guided or taught by any Persons; neither by his Lordship doing it on the same Terms; that if no one can judge but Christ, what he designed should be contain'd in the Institution; that his Lordship's Judgment, like the rest, may go for nothing; that*

that if it is impossible (if Christ's Mind is not plainly spoken about it) to make up that Defect; that his Lordship's Account of *its Nature, End, and Use*, may be looked on as a vain and impossible Attempt to make it plainer; and that if no Authority is to be submitted to by Christians, that his Lordship in honour will strip himself first, by formal Disclaim, and declaring that he for his part, though a Priest, and a Bishop, yet does not pretend to teach, *as one having thereby any Authority, but as the Scribes.*

If the Christian Ministry have any Commission from Christ to preach the Gospel, and if it is any part of their Duty, by virtue of that Commission from him; or if by the Laws of their Country only, they are authorized and appointed officially, to *affirm, to guide, to teach, to interpret* Christ's Commands, and explain his Institutions; so far as they exercise that Right within its regular Bounds, to the proper Subjects of their Care; so far *their* Expositions ought to carry in them so much of the Authority; not their own, but of the Institutor of the Duties Authority; or of the Bodies Authority, which they are Members of, as to make an answerable Regard due to them, as of *some Importance*, at least to those who are not capable of immediate Recourse to Christ's or his Apostles Declarations; and whose accidental Circumstances make the Mind of Christ, however plainly delivered, inaccessible to them, and who must either believe and practise this, and other Christian Duties, by relying on the Authority of others Testimony, or not at all.

P R O P. VI.

The Passages in the New Testament which relate to this Duty, and they alone, are the original Accounts of the Nature and End of this Institution, and the only authentick Declarations, upon which, we of later Ages can safely depend; being written by the immediate Followers of our Lord; those who were Witnesses themselves to the Institution; or were instructed by those that were so; and join with them in delivering down one and the same Account of this Religious Duty.

R E M. This no body denies, that I know, or ever did, viz. that the Passages in the New Testament are the original, the true, and only true Account of the Nature, and End of the Sacrament. And from this all Christian Churches (none excepted) have always taken their Notions, and founded their Doctrines and Practices, however different, upon it; and the Question is, Who understand this Account best, and deduce the truest and justest Consequences from it?

The different Sense that not only private learned Men, but Christian Churches have of the original Accounts, and the different Practice upon it, shew that not only the common Body of unlearned Christians, but the best qualified Persons, want all the Helps of Guidance and Assistance from others, that the Bishop would have thought to be of little Importance; and that Learning and Ability, added to Care and Honesty, cannot secure human Infirmary from Misapprehensions, and false Notions of it. Only this, I think, one may be sure of; that all the Christian World, at all times, since the Apostles Time to this, has not been mistaken as to the *Nature, End, and Use of the Duty*; but some have been right, and still

still are so: And it might have been a sufficiently bold Attempt in a private Christian, to shew his Country-Men, which of all the Notions that Christian Churches have had, or have of it, are the rightest and trulyest drawn from the original Declarations. But to charge all in general with Error, and pretend that every Christian consulting the Original, may at this time of Day, perceive the Nature of the Duty to be such, in the most important Point, as is entirely new, is a great Presumption beyond Credibility; and that it has been reserved to the Reverend Author of this Treatise, to set the Christian World right in the Notion of this Duty, by finding out Christ's Design in it to be such, as hardly any suspected it to be till now, or of late.

What his Lordship does to make this Discovery, is but what all the different Professors and Practisers of it do, and always have done; they all refer to the original Declarations, as he does; they all found as he does their Doctrines upon them, and their Additions, which by as plain and clear Construction and Deduction, they severally pretend, speak the Sense they put upon them; as his Lordship would have them thought to speak his; but to little Purpose, according to his Lordship, since what they *teach* or *affirm*, is not to be minded, so neither by the same Rule, what his Lordship says, or his saying so. Or if any do mind it, yet they ought not to receive or reject what he says, till they have done what all others say to the contrary, the same Justice.

Let his Lordship produce an Instance of any Christian Church, since the Apostles time, that thought of the Sacrament as he would persuade Men to think, *viz.* that it was an Act of bare Remembrance, that no spiritual Benefits or Privi-
E
leges

leges were annexed to; that no Christian ought to mind, or value what the whole Christian World said or thought of it, or how they discharged it, or with what Faith and Hopes. Let him I say produce Instances of this, not as Authority and Presidents to *teach, guide,* or influence us; for that would be unreasonable to desire, because that is contrary to his Rules and Doctrine; to walk by the Authority of Examples, though universal. But only to shew us, that his Lordship is not singular, and his Notions Novelty beyond all Example, but that there have been Bodies of Christians of his Mind: For it is monstrous to suppose, that the Sacrament has neither been administered or received with just Sentiment of its Nature and End, nor gone to, but with false Views, and groundless Hopes, from the Age of its Institution, till now his Lordship has opened our Eyes. There have been particular Persons indeed, who have denyed, or not acknowledged any Benefits to be annexed to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; some would have it to be received merely for Obedience Sake to the Civil Government; and the, &c. and some Enthusiasts amongst ourselves, such as the Anabaptists, have thought it only a (*Tessera*) mark of Religious Distinction. Those called the *Family of Love*, thought themselves too perfect for it, and above being subject to Ordinances, and wanting no spiritual Advantages from it. And *Theodore* mentions it as an Error of the *Messalians*, called also the *Euchitæ* and Enthusiasts, that it did the Receivers neither good nor hurt. And *Rogers* (*Art. 39.*) mentions the Symbolists, Figurists, and Significatists, who were of Opinion, that the Faithful in the Lord's Supper do receive nothing but the bare Signs. Mr. *Hooker* (*Book 5.*) says, *Some did exceedingly fear,*
left

lest Zuinglius and Oecolampadius, would bring to pass, that Men should account of this Sacrament, but only of a Shadow, destitute, empty, and void of Christ; but seeing that by opening the several Opinions which have been held, they are grown for ought I can see, on all Sides at length to a general Agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely, the real Participation of Christ, and of Life in his Body and Blood, by Means of this Sacrament; wherefore should the World continue still distracted, &c. And Zuinglius indeed in St. Matbew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, translated our Saviour's Words, *This is my Body*, &c. *This signifies my Body*, &c. where Mr. Chillingworth excuses the Translation from Falsification, by saying, that the Language our Saviour spoke in, had no Word for *to signify*, but used *to be*, for it.

Mr. Hales of Eaton, is the only Person of great Character amongst us, next under his Lordship, whose Treatise is lately produced upon the Sacrament in Vindication of his Lordship's from Singularity. But that ever memorable Gentleman takes upon him too magisterially for one of his Station, and with an air of one too full of himself to put off as he does, his Propositions and Conclusions, as Oracles to his Consulter, and the Christian World, to the lessening his and their Value, were they as just, as they are false.

So the *Pelagian* Heresy, indeed, as denying the Necessity of any Grace, must include this also, of none being annexed to the Sacrament.

The Reason that his Lordship gives, why every Christian is to found his Notions of the Sacrament upon the divine Records only, and on immediate Recourse to them, makes, I think, rather against him. Which is, *because a very few Years make a great Alteration in Mens Notions and Language about*

such Points of Religion; and the Distance of many Years, makes still a greater Alteration, whilst Men of various Opinions and strong Imaginations, are continually going on to comment and enlarge upon such Subjects. For by this Argument, the first Accounts next to the Apostles Times, are likeliest to be best; and the farther we are removed down from those Times, the more likely Mens Notions and Language about the Sacrament are to be wrong; and consequently his Lordship's stand fairest to be none of the best, because the last; as theirs, who shall write against him, are to be worse again than his; unless they are Editions of Notions of it, of less modern Date than his.

The Alterations of Language, and Notions, made by Time, make it impossible to form just Notions of the Sacrament upon the original Account of it, or other Duties, in the divine Records, without knowing not only what Sense the original Terms bore then, when they were delivered; but also what Alteration of that Sense they may have undergone since, or what other, and new Sense, different from the first, we may have put upon them; for all which, the most able and learned must depend upon the Testimony of others; and the unlearned, and less skilful, on theirs again by the second or third Hand. This his Lordship's so considerable *Comment* and *Enlargement* upon the original Account of the Sacrament; his many and long Paraphrases, to open the Sense of a few Words; the Use that he makes of what Writers affirm, and of Lexicons to guide him, and give that *Importance* and *Authority* to his Explications of the few original Terms, which is contrary to his own Doctrine, and to adjust their Construction; shews that the original Declaration, however plain and sufficient

at its Delivery, is not now so plain, as to be understood without considerable Helps and Dependencies, even by so great a Man as his Lordship; much less by those weaker, for whose Instruction he particularly writes this Treatise, who must trust to his Lordship as he does to others; who after he himself has with the greatest *Care* and *Honesty*, to be sure, so far as he could, taken all his *Notions of this Duty from the New Testament*, yet may be found to be much in the wrong, and mistaken perhaps at last.

P R O P. VII.

The Writers of the New Testament give an Account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper in the following Passages, which therefore are principally to be regarded, viz. Math. xxvi. 26, &c. Mark xiv. 22, &c. Luke xxii. 19, &c. and 1 Cor. xi. 23, &c.

A few Remarks upon the Expressions made use of in these Passages, will be useful in order to lead us to their true Meaning; and to the right Understanding the Duty appointed in them.

R E M. The first Attempt that his Lordship makes, in order to lay down the original Account in such a plain and intelligible manner, that every Christian capable of Thinking at all upon the Subject, may be able immediately to see whether (he) conveys to him the true Notions of this Duty left us by Christ (p. 2.) by immediate Recourse to the Declarations of Jesus Christ, and those to whom he himself declared what his Design was in this Institution: Is, by fixing the Sense of the Word (*εὐχαριστίας*) *Matth. xxvi. 26. Jesus took Bread and blessed it, that is, the Bread*, says our Translation; but without any Thing expressed in the Original, to answer the Word (it) as his Lordship observes; but his adding, or to require

quire it, is deciding a great Doubt upon his own Authority; and his Lordship taking upon him farther to say, that if instead of this *it*, they had added the Word (*God*) which has no more to answer it in the Original, than the Word (*it*) has; the Meaning of the Evangelist then would have been truly expressed thus: *Jesus having taken Bread, and having blessed God, brake it, &c.*

Whether this Interpretation, and this Supplement, contrary to our authorized Translation, is true or false; yet if it is drawn from the Original to his Lordship, it is not so drawn to those who know nothing of the Word *εὐλογῆσαι* who must entirely pin their Faith upon his Lordship, for what he would have it signify; and as for his Lordship saying;

That this is the one natural Sense of the Word εὐλογῆσαι in this Place, is plain from the Word used by St. Luke and St. Paul, in their Accounts of this Institution;—nay, St. Matthew and St. Mark themselves, direct us thus to interpret their own Word, relating to the Bread, by using the Word, εὐχαριστῆσαι, i. e. having given Thanks, when they speak of the Cup:

His Lordship must be sensible that he ought not to deliver out the Sense of the Word *εὐλογῆσαι* for *Thanksgiving*, in this Place, nor to add the Word (*God*) to it as a Supplement, to those whom he intends to instruct, with that Assurance, that he does, upon his own Head. For though it is true, that the Word *εὐλογεῖν*, is used several times in Scripture; to signify *to give Thanks*; yet it is used much oftner, for that which is its more proper and literal Sense, *to Bless*, or give Benediction to; and that it does so signify here, is the Judgment of the most and learnedest Commentators, added to that of our Translators. And if *giving Thanks*, is its Sense in this Place, yet the Bishop should
not

not say, that it is *its one natural Sense*; since it is neither the *only* nor the *natural*; nor do St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, by using the Word *ευχαριστίας*, when they speak of the Cup, direct us to interpret it as used relating to the Bread in the same Sense; if they had meant altogether the same thing by it, they would not have varied it; and I think it much more likely from the Variation only, and giving of another Word to signify giving Thanks, that this before had not signified it; and that all the Actions relate continuedly to the Bread; what he took he blest, what he blest he broke, and what he broke he gave; and that agreeably to the Custom, as well of the *Jews*, as other Nations, he sanctified and consecrated by (his) the Word of *God*, as *God*; and by Prayer as *Man*, what was to be received with Thanksgiving afterwards; not that it follows, that because he blest the Bread, that he might not likewise at the same Time, and in the same Form, give thanks also; or because he gave Thanks after he took the Cup, that he therefore gave no Blessing to that; any more than we are to think that no Blessing was given to either, because St. *Luke* only mentions *ευχαριστίας*, giving Thanks; or that they both signify the same thing. Blessing respects the Elements as the Object; and Thanksgiving respects *God*; when Christ took the Bread, he blest'd the Bread in the same Manner as he did the Loaves, when beyond their natural Virtue he was about to feed so many Thousands with them; upon which Occasion St. *John* (chap. vi. 11.) says, *ευχαριστίας* when he had given Thanks; St. *Matthew* (chap. xiv. 19.) says, *εὐλόγησεν*, he blessed; and St. *Luke*, to put out of dispute (chap. ix. 16.) what was the Object of his Blessing, adds *αὐτοῖς*, he blest'd, not *God*, but *them*, that is, the *Loaves*.
Where

Where the Construction will not bear Thanksgiv-
 ing for the Sense of εὐλόγησι any more than the
 Word (*it*) will bear it in our Translation. Not
 that tying the Sense of εὐλογήσεις, to our Saviour's
 giving or praying for a Blessing upon the Bread
 he took and brake, excludes his giving Thanks,
 as I have said, but probably includes it, though
 not express'd; each part of the solemn Action,
 of praying for a Blessing before Nourishment re-
 ceived, or giving Thanks for it afterwards, being
 by a compendious Custom of Speech used for
 both; as saying Grace with us, means both beg-
 ging God's Blessing before our Meals, and giving
 God Thanks afterwards, its proper Sense; or
 because the Benediction was a mixed Form, and
 had Gratulation commonly in it; *ex duplici exposi-*
tione una facillè conflatur, junguntur ibi simul, & gra-
tiarum actio, & promissionum commemoratio, (Pet.
 Mart.) As the *Tipblay* or *Beracboth* at the Jewish
 Passover, for that Reason bore either Name,
Blessing or Thanksgiving; and Grotius observes, that
 the Syriac renders εὐλογήσεις, both by *Benediction*
 and *Thanksgiving* also; and the Evangelists used
 both Words to assure us more particularly that
 our Saviour did both. Besides the order of Time
 when our Saviour pronounced this εὐλογήσεις, and
 the Place it stands in, makes *Benediction* much
 more likely to be, if not its only, yet its prin-
 cipal Sense; and *Thanksgiving* alone to be less
 proper; for as praying for a Blessing naturally
 goes before the receipt of a Benefit, and looks
 forward; so *Thanksgiving* as naturally looks back-
 ward and follows Favours received; and to give
 Thanks for our Bread before we eat it, is as im-
 proper, as praying for a Blessing upon it unseaso-
 nably, not till 'tis over. And our Saviour's
 giving his Blessing to the Bread before he brake
 it,

it, or gave it to his Disciples, or they eat it, gives Propriety to the Action; whilst giving Thanks for it, before that was done, is out of Time and Place. For Christ to give his Blessing to that Bread that he was about to give his Disciples, to make it efficacious to all the good and great Purposes which the Solemnity of the Action required, is an easy and natural Thought; but that he should thank God for what was not yet given, is not so proper. Besides, as *εὐλογεῖν* is used for *Thanksgiving*, *εὐχαριστεῖν* is observed for imploring a Blessing. (*Grot. Matth. xxvi. 26.*) And the Lord's Supper was called by either Name, by the Ancients, *Eucharist*, or *Eulogy*, though the former has more prevailed. And for the same Reason that his Lordship would have *εὐλογήσας*, to signify, giving God thanks for the Bread; one may say that *εὐχαριστήσας*, signifies begging a Blessing upon the Cup; and not giving Thanks. Tho' *εὐλογήσας* did not signify he *blessed the Bread*, yet his *taking it* up alone, his formal Touch blessed and consecrated it; his calling it, upon taking it up, his Body, farther shews that it was blest to Purpose; or shews that it did not want it: Though no more had been said or done to it, the giving it that Name, and making it the Thing, proved it blessed in the highest Degree. To pretend that what he vouchsafed to bear the Name of his *most blessed Body and Blood* (*Office of the Com.*) was not blessed, is the Height of Prophaneness; and to say, that it does not bless those who worthily receive it, in some manner is little less so.

And if our Saviour at the Institution blessed the Bread, and at the same time annexed thereby the Consequences of his Divine Benediction upon it, so by that Blessing then annexed, he annexed it to attend the faithful and worthy Discharge of doing

the same, which he enjoin'd the Continuance of.

The Reader must here observe how consistent, as well the Length of those Paraphrases, which make up a great Part of his Book; as well as his no short, and hard laboured Explications, as well of this first Word, as most of the rest that he undertakes; are with that *Plainness, Simplicity, and Brevity* of the original Account, which his Lordship speaks of; and which make him reflect on *Enlargements, and Treatises upon this Subject; each Christian of the lowest Understanding will judge.*

The original Account, he says, (p. 20.) takes up but two or three small Verses in any one of the Evangelists, or in St. Paul. Yet two or three small Verses, so plain, so simple, his Lordship, who speaks a great deal in a little, swells into several hundred Lines by his Paraphrases only, to put them in a tolerable Light to his Reader; and it is well if he does so at last; and his Explication sometimes of a single Word, costs him some Pages; and I am apt to think must cost him some more, to justify most of them. To turn his Lordship's Words upon himself: How can one imagine that our Lord left his Will to be thus declared for him, by a Man who should live near two thousand Years after him? (p. 23.) I say not this to reflect on any well meaning Writer; but on a well meaning Writer, reflecting upon himself.

The next Part of the Institution which his Lordship explains is, *St. Luke xxii. 19. This do in Remembrance of me.*

On these Words his Lordship founds the following Proposition.

P R O P. VIII.

It appears from these Passages, that the End for which our Lord instituted this Duty, was the Remembrance

brance of himself; that the Bread to be taken and eaten, was appointed to be the Memorial of his Body broken; and the Wine to be drank, was ordained to be the Memorial of his Blood shed; or according to the express Words of St. Paul, that the one was to be eaten, and the other to be drank, in Remembrance of Christ; and this to be continued till he that was once present with his Disciples, and is now absent, shall come again.

R E M. I cannot think his Lordship's new Argument against Transubstantiation, which under this Proposition he again mentions, to be more plain and easy, to common Understandings, than those taken from the absolute Impossibility of the Thing, and its Contradiction to all our Senses. From which I would not have our common People wrought off from entire Dependance upon, by insinuated Distrusts of it. Or its giving way to any other, as plainer and better: But rather stick to that insuperable one. Whilst seeing is believing, and feeling the Truth with them; the same invincible Evidence of their Senses, that our Saviour put the Proof of his Resurrection upon; and St. John that of the whole Gospel, 1 John i. 1. that which we have seen with our Eyes, which we have looked upon, and our Hands have handled, must and will disprove Transubstantiation to them; which nothing but irresistible Force will endanger the Kingdoms feign'd Conversion to, even though the Discovery of this new Argument had not been made. There cannot be a plainer Argument for unlearned Christians, than *Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*; and our Saviour's Body since it was glorified in Heaven, has neither Flesh nor Blood for us to eat and drink, were it allowed to be really present, and received in the Sacrament; and if the Bread and Wine are his Flesh and Blood,

which is unglorifying it, and changing back his *glorious* Body, to *be like our vile Bodies*; uncloathing it again from *Immortality* and *Incorruption*; and making it every Thing that it was; but now for that Reason they cannot be his Body, which is not now a natural, but a spiritual Body, consisting of no such Materials; its having either of is not. And to make their Doctrine consistent, they should either change the Form of Consecration, and instead of saying, *this is my Body*, should say this is Christ's Body, that was Flesh and Blood, but now is not so; or make Christ have two sorts of Bodies, one of Flesh and Blood to be received here in the Sacrament, in ten thousand different Places at once, under all Dimensions, made of Flesh and Blood, that the sacramental Elements are changed into; that was, and is not, to them neither Flesh or Blood; which now is, and was not, when the Sacrament was instituted.

The very Name Transubstantiation is founded on false Philosophy; all bodily Substance is the same, especially those that are the Subjects concerned in this Doctrine; Bread is daily turned into Flesh; and Flesh again into Bread; Wine into Blood, and Blood again into Wine; yet none ever thought, or called this a Change of the Matter or Substance, but of the Form only, and accidental Properties; and if the sacramental Bread and Wine, were turned into the Body and Blood of Christ, it would not still be Transubstantiation but Transformation; a Metamorphose, such as

Ovid
In nova fert animas mutatas dicere formas,
Corpora —————

speaks of.

But they change the Substance, which needs not be changed, to make the Conversion they would have,

have, and do not change those accidental Properties, which do. Christ's natural Body is further changed from what it was when Flesh and Blood, than Bread and Wine are, when turned into Flesh and Blood, yet none will say that Christ's Body is transubstantiated, but that it is the same Substance, and consists of the same fundamental Materials; and if there is any Transubstantiation, it must not be of a Body into another sort of Body; but of corporeal Substance into incorporeal; and if there were such Changes as they would have in the consecrated Elements, it must be Christ's Body that is changed into Bread and Wine, and not the Bread and Wine into that; for we see they do not change their Properties; but cannot be sure t'other way; if Christ destroyed the Substance of Bread and Wine, and put his Body in its stead, there still would be no Transubstantiation in the case, if there were Flesh, Blood or Body. Nay, though he changed the Accidents too, and gave them his own Form. And they had better turn their Doctrine the other Way, and say that Christ's Body is changed into Bread and Wine, than the Bread and Wine into it; for that we are sure is not, the other we cannot be sure of.

That the Lord's Supper, as his Lordship asserts, *was expressly designed for the Remembrance of Christ after he was taken away*, has no Opposers; but barely for that and no more; and that no Effects were designed to attend or follow that Remembrance, has been as universally disbelieved, or rather as unthought of, as out of all Christian Thought, as the other acknowledged.

P R O P. IX.

Whoever therefore in a serious and religious Sense of his Relation to Christ, as his Disciple, performs these
Actions

Actions of eating Bread, and drinking Wine, in Remembrance of Christ, as a Person corporally absent from his Disciples, most certainly performs them agreeably to the End of the Institution, declared by Christ himself, and his immediate Disciples.

R. E. M. That after their Consecration the Elements are Elements still ; the Bread is still Bread, and the Wine still Wine, and not Christ's natural Body and Blood, is most certain ; to think otherwise, is to belye at once four of those five Senses that God has made the Foundation of all our Knowledge. That it is Bread and Wine that we receive, is as certain as that we have received any thing, and stands upon the same Evidence as the whole Transaction does ; or that we have received at all ; we have the same Evidence for it, as that we have been at Church, and the Testimony of two Senses more for it, than that we have seen the Priest or People there ; and Transubstantiation supposed, is a lying Miracle ; it is to make Nature lie to us, us lie to ourselves, and God impose a Miracle upon us all, made up of Lies and Contradiction ; we must believe those very Senses that we disbelieve, and disbelieve those that we yet must believe at the same Time. But his Lordship's new Argument against it from Remembrance of Christ as *a Person corporally absent*, must bear the Bell, come of it what will ; though I have already observed, that it is not too much to be depended upon. And in my humble Opinion, his Lordship had much better give it up, than endeavour to support it by such a Novelty, and I think Extravagancy, as making the first Celebration of it by our Saviour at its Institution, to be a mere empty Form ; and that his so solemnly *Blessing* the Elements, and *giving Thanks*, was but on his Side, design'd for a Lesson to teach and shew

shew them the way to do it afterwards; and on
 theirs, no serious act of Religion performed in earn-
 est; and all this because his bodily Presence was
 inconsistent with its being an act of Remembrance
 of him. For could it not be in Remembrance of
 all those Acts of Humiliation that he had already
 undergone, of all that they had been Witnesses to
 his having done and suffered? Could it not be in
 Remembrance of that his Death, and future Pas-
 sion of his, which he had told them was then
 coming on? For acts of Remembrance of any
 Person may as properly be discharged with respect
 to what Men know is to come upon them, as to
 what is already past; and *Abraham that saw*
Christ's Day, in his sacrificed Son, and the sacri-
 ficed Ram, might have celebrated this Institution
 in Remembrance of the Lamb slain from the Be-
 ginning of the World; if he did not from the
 Hands of *Melchisedeck* discharge by Faith the
 Duty, and received his annexed Blessing upon it;
 as the faithful amongst the *Jews* might eat their
 typical Lamb in their Passover, in Remembrance
 of the Sacrifice of this real one. And if his
 Lordship can prove from Texts of Scripture,
 that there was no real Duty discharged by that ori-
 ginal Celebration by the divine Institutor himself,
 no religious Duty discharged by that most perfect
 Original, he at once destroys all religious Reality
 in all those less perfect Administrations that have
 been celebrated since, that derive all their Virtue
 from their being just Copies of that Original,
 and Memorials of that which was none itself;
 and if the Apostles received no benefit from re-
 ceiving his Body and Blood from those blessed
 Hands, his Lordship would then carry his Point
 beyond Dispute, that none is to be hoped for from
 it by any body since.

P R O P. X.

There being other Passages in the New Testament, besides those already cited, which occasionally relate to this Subject ; it is of Importance to all Christians to consider them, and to examine what farther Instructions they contain about this holy Duty.

The first of those is, 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? &c.

R E M. His Lordship finds it necessary to load St. Paul's Account here given of the Sacrament, with a Paraphrase that is much longer than is consistent with his represented Plainness of the scriptural Accounts of the Duty, besides an Explication none of the shortest ; yet after all, I am persuaded that his Readers will generally agree, that the stubborn Apostle will by no means be wrought upon to speak in his Favour ; though his Lordship condescends to call in Fathers, viz. Chrysostom, Theoph. &c. to his Assistance, though of small Importance to us, to know what they write upon the Subject.

The Cup of Blessing which we bless, τὸ ποτεῖον τῆς εὐλογίας ἡ εὐλογία, the emphatical Article that attends each Word, demands rather to be thus Paraphrased ; that so conspicuous and remarkable Cup, charged by Christ with the Conveyance of remarkable Blessings, which gives it its Name, which is derived to it from Christ through our Ministry and Office ; than as his Lordship, without regard to any thing eminent pointed to by those Articles, thus flatly represents the Cup of Blessing or the Thanksgiving Cup, over which we speak good Words of Praise and Thank-
giving

giving to God. And in a Note upon it, says, Thus the Words, *the Cup of Blessing* (ἐὐλογίας) which we bless (ὁ ἐὐλογεῖται) appear to signify beyond all reasonable doubt. Our blessed Lord's Thanksgiving over the Bread at the Institution of this Rite, is expressed by St. Matthew and St. Mark by the same Word (ἐὐλογίας); whether St. Matthew's and St. Mark's (ἐὐλογίας) signify restrictively *Thanksgiving*, is far from being beyond all reasonable Dispute to others, whatever it may be to his Lordship; or however the Cup of (ἐὐλογίας) *Blessing* may be admitted to have its grammatical Propriety softened down, to mean the Cup of *Thanksgiving* here, after the same manner that St. Matthew's and St. Mark's (ἐὐλογίας) may be allowed to have it so; that is, at most inconclusively, as it expressed a mixed Action, or by a customary Figure of Speech, putting a Part of the Action for the whole, and they were promiscuously used for each other, yet both the Sense, and the Grammar forbids (ὁ ἐὐλογεῖται) which we bless, to have that Signification here; for the Article, ὁ, of the neuter Gender, and accusative Case, ties the Action that (ἐὐλογεῖται) denotes, to the Cup as its Object, and not to God; and his Lordship by no Means fairly represents the Construction in his Paraphrase, *by, over, which we speak good Words of Thanksgiving to (GOD)*; for there is neither any thing in the Text to answer either *over*, or *God*; for did ἐὐλογεῖται signify *Thanksgiving*, as his Lordship would have it, the true Reddition in *English* would be, *the Cup of Thanksgiving which we thanksgive*; and those whom his Lordship borrowed this and some other of his Conceits from, are forced to make very bold with the Text, not only by changing the Case of the Article, ὁ, and adding a Preposition, making an ὁ ἐπ' αὐτόν, or ἐπ' αὐτόν of it, but by a Supplement of

διδν, or, διδ, no where to be found. Indeed St. Paul seems to have added this, ὁ εὐλογεῖν, in such a manner, as on purpose to give it a Sense distinct from Thanksgiving; and by that to fix also that of εὐλογία before, and to give the Reason why he had called it the Cup of Blessing before, so as it should not be mistaken for *Thanksgiving*; which is not the native Sense of εὐλογία, as we find by the Latins, who formed their Word *benedico* from it; to signify to *bless*, and not give Thanks; and if, as 'tis likely, St. Paul used the Word, εὐλογεῖν, because it is the Word that St. Matthew and St. Mark express our Saviour's Meaning by at the Institution; this instead of proving that εὐλογία, and εὐλογεῖν, here signify, to give Thanks, proves that our Saviour's εὐχαριστίας used there over the Cup, had εὐλογεῖν included in it, and signified to bless. Because St. Paul applies it here to the Cup, though it is not there express'd, but applied to the Bread only. *The Cup of Blessing* is not only the *blessed Cup*, the Cup that Benediction is given to, by Collation of Virtue upon it; but the *blessing Cup* also, the Cup that communicates Virtue and Grace to those who are Partakers of it. *Cujus hausta benedictio infunditur*, by drinking of which, Blessing is infused; *per quem participantes benedicuntur*, by which those that partake of it are blessed. Thro' it, Christ blessing it, blesses us. For thus in all the same Cases of Construction, we understand Cup in an active Sense; Thus *the Cup of Consolation*, is that which works and communicates Comfort; the Cup of Affliction that which afflicts; thus (*poculum sanitatis, hilaritatis, dementie, &c.*) the Cup of Health, Gbearfulness, Madness, &c. that which makes healthy, merry, mad, &c. And the Cup of Blessing must be a grammatical Singularity of the same Construction, if it signifies not, the

the Cup which causally works and communicates happy Effects, and Influences; and *ὁ εὐλογεῖν* expresses the Way and Means, by which it receives what it communicates; and with *Beza*, I think that *Oecumenius* justly expresses the Sense by *ὁ κατασκευάζων εὐλογεῖν*, *which Blessing we prepare*; provided we understand the whole Share of what the Apostles and Ministers of Christ have in bringing that Blessing upon the Cup, to lye in *κατασκευάζων*, in the Preparation only; so that the Sense is, *the Cup charged with Blessing which it communicates to those who worthily partake of it*; which Blessing, it does not receive from the officiating Minister, in any degree, nor by Conveyance of any Virtue to it from him, founded on any Power or Authority in him, nor derived to it by any Ministrations of his, either by Prayer or Thanksgiving; but immediately from Christ through him, as an instrumental Cause only, without Efficiency. As often as Christ's Ministers, duly and solemnly prepare Bread and Wine to be received, pursuant to his command, by his faithful Servants, in Remembrance of him, and representatively of his Death, so often by this Channel, as a Reward for this Service, does he annex supernatural Benefits to the Discharge of this Duty; and through the Acts of his Ministers, make the Cup produced and exhibited by them, first a blessed Cup, in the passive Sense, and then a blessing Cup, in the active. And how is it possible that it should be otherwise, and not communicate Blessing; and be a Cup of Blessing; when it is no longer to be called Bread or Wine? But by his own special Command, the Wine is to be called *Christ's Blood*, and the Bread *his Body*; and the receiving one, *St. Paul* tells us, is the Communion of the Blood of Christ; and of the other the Communion of his

G 2

Body;

Body; and we all plainly seeing, and knowing, that they are not naturally and substantially so, they must consequently some other way answer that high Name, by being virtually so; which he that denies, talks almost as wildly as he that asserts Transubstantiation, and more like an Infidel: It was the Sense of the immediate present Benefits received, no less than the past and future commemorated, that gave this Duty the Name of the Eucharist, and the Wine that of the *Calice*; by Wine *that Thanksgiving ought to be exercised over*, by the Ancients; and he that would take off all Benefits annexed to it, bids fair to destroy its being called the Eucharist, takes off one considerable Part of its Title to it, and Reason of it. And its being in the Sense I mention, *the Cup of Blessing*, makes it to be so much the more the Cup of Thanksgiving. If no Grace, Benefits, or Privileges are received from it, I do not see how it deserves the Name of the Eucharist on its own Account. It is from what Men receive, and not from what they give, that the Sacrament has both its Name and Nature. Let his Lordship produce any Subject of Thanksgiving expressly appropriated to it in Scripture, but the Benefits included in itself, to call it the Eucharist from. It is the happy Effects of it, that turn it from a Memorial, to the Eucharist, and which are the Grounds of giving that Catholick Name to it.

But whatever virtual Change is wrought in the Elements, that raises them from being common Bread and Wine, to become Christ's Body and Blood, and adds to their natural a sacramental Nature, Dignity, and Virtue, is not from the Minister, or any converse Efficiency in what he either says or does; who uses not so much as either Prayer or Thanksgiving in the mystical Consecration

eration to superinduce any spiritual Virtue into them ; but whatever virtual Change they undergo is from Christ himself the divine Institutor. The Minister, in order to discharge the Duty of eating Bread and drinking Wine in Remembrance of his Death and Passion, in the same Manner that he set the Example, acts and treats them as he did, only pronounces over them, those Words that he pronounced ; which Action and which Words of their Creator, his Creatures of Bread and Wine perceiving, feel their Force, and obey as they did when first spoken by himself, and become the same still to all worthy Receivers, that he made them to his Apostles. It is the Power of his Words and his Action alone, that consecrate them, that sanctifies, that impregnates them institutionally, with Powers naturally not their own, and a Name bespeaking those Powers ; they and the Ministers have no more hand in making them answer the Name they are called by, and are the Means of doing, than *Elisha* and the Waters of *Jordan* had in curing *Naaman's* Leprosy ; than the Clay or Pool of *Siloan* had in curing the blind Man ; or than the Words of *Peter* and *John* had in restoring the Cripple ; and if there is any such Charm or Enchantment, which his Lordship thinks fit to talk of, in what the holy Sacrament is, or conveys, the Minister in our Church has no hand in it ; it is Christ himself that is the Magician and Conjuror ; and no more in this, than in all other Cases by which without natural Means or Connexion, he conveys his Gifts and Graces, and all supernatural Favours ; and his Lordship might as justly charge giving Alms, or saying Grace, or all Prayer, with working by Charm, as the holy Sacrament, which by the Name and Nature of the Thing, stands fairer to be *medium* of conveying

ing divine Favours, and working supernatural Effects, than the Exercise of all his moral Virtues put together, which promise no such Consequences, as receiving what is called by himself Christ's Body and Blood. Our Divines indeed to expose the *Popish* Doctrine of the *Opus Operatum*, or the Sacraments conferring Grace, by its own Power and Virtue, and not by the Operation of the Instructor, and the holy Spirit, in and through them, call it Charm, and their being consecrated by the Power of Words murmured over the Elements by the Priest; but insist still on *Blessing* not signifying Thanksgiving in this Passage of St. Paul. Thus (Willet's Synops. Pap.) on the Sacrament, on 1 Cor. x. 16. the *Cup of Blessing which we bless, &c. we deny not but that to bless here, doth signify to sanctify, or consecrate*; speaking not only in his own Name, but the Name of the Protestant World; and this in answer to the Papists, objecting to us his Lordship's Construction of the Words *ευλογίας* and *ευλογῶμεν*. Thus Fulk. Test. 1 Cor. x. *We profess that to bless here doth signify to sanctify, or to consecrate; and that the Cup is blessed or consecrated by us, to be a Sacrament of the Blood of Christ, not by magical Murmuration of Words, but by the whole Action according to Christ's Institution.*

When you say the Calvinists use no Consecration of the Cup, 'tis impudent Slander; that it is a monstrous Lyemy Lord, says he, that you say we profess that we make no Consecration, Benediction, or Sanctification of the Bread at all, (Chap. 11.)

Per benedictionem intelligunt nonnulli consecrationem, quam nos a Sacramento minime repellimus, modo rectè intelligatur. (*Pet Mart. 1 Cor.*)

The next Term in St. Paul's Relation of the Institution, that the Bishop explains, is the Word

κοινωνία, the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ (p. 39.) which gives his Lordship considerable Trouble to make out the Signification of it to his Mind. He tells us,

The Greek Word κοινωνία, and communion which is Latin; both signify a joint partaking, or partaking of something in common with others.

But, *κοινωνία*, signifies not only the joint partaking of something in common; but the communicating also something to others to be partaken of, and distributing it to many; and respects the Act of the Communicator. And in this Sense here expresses the Act of Christ communicating *his Body and Blood*, which not being naturally communicated, but virtually only, if no Virtue is communicated, nothing at all is communicated under that Name.

And whereas in his Lordship's Sense, of its being the *joint partaking of something in common*; he says it can signify no more than *eating Christ's Body, and drinking his Blood, as a Society of his Disciples*; is that a small Matter? What would he have more? Or what can be more and greater than to partake of Christ's Body and Blood? And as by Concorporation to have derived to us Advantages answerable to those which a Body and Blood naturally receive from their proper Head; such as with Union, Sense and Life, and Direction; and which our Church in her Service calls *a great Benefit spiritually to eat Christ's Flesh and drink his Blood*; adding, as implied in it, that *then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us, we are one with Christ, and Christ with us*; partaking from him distributively, that divides to every Man as he pleases, Gifts and Graces, suitable to our several Wants, and salutary and sanctifying Effects suggested and subministred to the Increase of Faith, Hope, and Charity,

Charity, in Portions and Degrees agreeable to the spiritual State and Circumstances of the Recipients; and our Saviour himself (*John vi. 53, 54.*) teaches us, that *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*, is of the most important Meaning; *except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last Day; for my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* What our Saviour here says, of *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*, as its Effect and Consequence, may be true indeed of receiving and embracing his Doctrine; if, as the Bishop contends, he meant that by it in this Place; but it must be true also of receiving the holy Sacrament, because doing that, and that only, himself assures us is so, and calls by that Name. And why then should his Lordship presume to tell us that eating Christ's Body, and drinking his Blood, comes to no such great Matter; which our Saviour pronounces such mighty Things of? Had the Apostle explain'd Communion in Christ's own Words, yet says his Lordship, *the meaning of this would have been plainly, that in the Lord's Supper, we do not eat and drink Bread and Wine, as at an ordinary Meal, that's all; but as Memorials of the Body and Blood of Christ, in Honour to him, as the Head of that Body of which we are Members; and the very same Sense seems the only Sense, in which the Communion, or joint partaking of his Body and Blood, can reasonably here be understood.*

This is denying our Saviour's consequence; if by *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*, our Saviour meant that which his Lordship cannot be sure he did, then it is of the utmost Importance to human Salvation with him; but if he meant that

that which he is sure Christ bids us think to be so; then it is no more than *not eating and drinking as at an ordinary meal*; and it is paying beside too great a Compliment to his own Judgment, to make his Explication of *eating and drinking Christ's Body and Blood, the only reasonable Sense of it*, and putting too great an Affront on those many great and learned Men, who have other and higher Notions of it.

But his Lordship is resolved to explain St. Paul's (*κοινωνία*) *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, so, as shall import no benefit to the Receiver, and to deprive Christians of that considerable Article of Faith and Hope, that from the Age of the Institution has attended them going to the Lord's Supper, and strike off that so highly inviting Consideration of going to it. And to bring this about, he labours hard to shew us, that it was not the Apostle's design in this Argument, and that he had not the least Occasion to speak here of the Benefits of Christ's Death, but to invite the Corinthians to flee from Idolatry only. And runs out into a long Detail of Particulars, of Comparison between Heathen Sacrifice and the Lord's Supper; interspersed with almost a dozen Paraphrases, with Comments upon them, not upon what the Apostle has said only, but what he would, and should have said; and insists, that as the Apostle could not suppose that any Benefits were to be received by partaking of the Cup and Table of Devils, so neither to support the Parallel and Opposition, that he argues upon, could he intend any Benefits to be received, by partaking of the Cup of the Lord. And let all this be as he would have it, let the Apostle here speak of the *Communion of Christ's Body and Blood*, without any intended respect to Benefits from it; yet what is that to*

H

the

the Purpose? Does that alter the Nature of the Expression, or make it signify more or less? Does that determine the Nature of that Communion, against any Benefits being imported in it, or conveyed by it? Because Men talk of the Sacrament with other Views than those of its Benefits, must that be a Reason that there are none, or they think none annexed to it? How many Disputes are there between us and the Papists about the Sacrament, without intent to speak of its Benefits? Is that an Argument that they believe there are none, which stand supposed to both? Our Saviour was using no dissuasives from Idolatry, nor from partaking of Heathen Sacrifices, when the Apostles received the Cup and Bread from his Hands, under the high Character of his Body and Blood; and which was the Communion of it to them; and his Lordship does not allow that to have been the Discharge of so much as of the Duty of Remembrance of him; and can his Lordship suppose, that all that our Saviour then did went for nothing? Was only an empty Lesson to shew them how to do it, when it was to go in good earnest; that they neither discharged a Duty, nor received an Advantage by it? The Devil should not have been so hasty in entring into *Judas*, upon it, as an unworthy Receiver, and not discerning the Lord's Body, unless he really was a Receiver: His Lordship's Account of the Nature, End and Use of the original Institution, makes a strange Transaction of it, that it was only an Essay, and not a real and true Administration of the Sacrament. It might have been sufficient in such a Case for our Saviour to have taught his Apostles the Manner of doing it, so as to have armed them sufficiently against the fatal Error of expecting any good from it; notwithstanding the high Names he called the Bread

Bread and Wine by, by communicating none to them, and making them sensible that they were never the better for it; but it fell at this rate hard upon *Judas* to receive Damnation to himself, only by way of Pattern to the Eleven, and to shew them how it was. And is it a likely Story, that our Saviour should Bless and give Thanks, over Bread and Wine, that his Apostles were to receive from him, without intent of their having any happy Operation? Did those Hands, whose touch consecrated and sanctified and made every thing a Blessing, that came from them to the Receivers, give none in the solemnest Present that he ever made to Man, adorned with Characters bespeaking Virtue above all that is creatural? Does a Christian Bishop insist on expresse Promises as wanted to assure us of Benefits and Privileges annexed to the worthily Receiving from him what himself calls his Body and Blood? Can Promises of spiritual Virtues and Blessing be wanted to assure us of what carries in itself Demonstration exceeding all Promises? The Institution is itself a Promise, and the Words of it still a greater Promise. When he gives us himself, shall we think he gives us nothing, without farther Promise of something that will do us good annexed to it to go along with it? The Name and Nature of the thing exceeds all Promise? And shall we not with the Apostle say, *that he that gives us his Son, how shall he not freely give us all things*; if any thing else that we are fit to receive, is not included in it? If a Man received the Holy Ghost, with equal Reason may an expresse Promise be required, and a Reason given, to prove that it was a peculiar Benefit; or when the Devil is said to enter into Man, as into *Judas*, an expresse Text may be demanded to prove it was to his Disadvantage.

Had our Saviour said to *Zaccheus*, got into the Tree to see him, *make haste and come down* only, can any one think that his ready Obedience thus far, though without promise of Benefit annexed to it, would have wanted its particular Reward? But Christ adding, *to Day I must abide at thy House*, and being there received hospitably; that the divine Guest, though without Promise annexed, did not particularly requite his Landlord; or that any other Person, who did any thing at his particular Command, was not as particularly paid for his Service and Obedience. When a *great Supper was made for him*, and *Martba* served, (*John xii.*) shall we think, though without Promise annexed, that he did not pay his Ordinary, and her as particularly for her particular Service that waited on him? And why should we think, that when by particular Command, added to Invitation, we are called to his own Table to Sup with the Lamb upon himself, and be with us, that we shall be sent empty away, and not filled with good things, and with *Apophoreta* too; and receive nothing from him there, peculiarly answering, those otherwise ostentatious, and vainly magnificent Characters, his *Body and Blood*, that himself in Words that are *Spirit and Truth* calls, *Meat indeed*, and *Drink indeed*. The very Name *Supper*, given it by *St. Paul*, the *Lord's Supper*, *1 Cor. xi.* if no Benefits are annexed, is nonsense and improper; a Supper intended to do Men no good, is an odd Supper indeed, which always implies Nutrition at least, and Comforts annexed.

There are a great many Commemorations of *Founders*, *Benefactors*, &c. kept up in the World; did his Lordship ever hear an Instance of *Men's eating the Body and drinking the Blood* of the commemorated appointed by himself, as a Commemorative

rative Rite; that he calls it *so plain, and the only Sense reasonably to be understood by partaking of Christ's Body and Blood*, that it must be an Act of bare Remembrance only, without any thing more in it, or to be hoped for from it. This is a strange way of *drawing the Nature and End of the Sacrament from Texts of Scripture alone*, to infer from its being the Communion and Participation of Christ's Body and Blood, that there can be no Benefits meant to be received from it.

The next offensive Term which stands in his Lordship's Way, and which he therefore by explaining, endeavours to remove out of it, is the Name Altar, for which he takes occasion from St. Paul's mentioning the Table of the Lord; (*Chap. x. 22.*) *ye cannot be Partakers of the Table of the Lord, and the Table of Devils.*

R E M. However just his Lordship's Criticisms may be, in distinguishing an Altar from a Table; yet the Distinction is hardly to be *drawn from Scripture only*; where either Name is used for either of them.

In the Beginning of the Reformation there was a considerable Dispute and Disturbance made amongst ourselves, by hot People on each Side more nice than wise, by whether Name, *Table*, or *Altar*, what the holy Sacrament was administered upon should be called; but so long as the Nature of the Oblation is settled, and the bloody Sacrifice removed, I think it indifferent, and of no great Importance, whether it is called an Altar or a Table now; or what occasion there is to revive this old Scruple, hardly worth making a stir about, so long as it is but put to its proper Protestant Use. Those who call'd it a Table at first, and determined it to be so, however by way of Reverence, took care to add the Word *holy* to it, or
in

in St. *Paul's* Phrase, to call it the *Lord's Table*. What is sacrificed upon, is an Altar, and what is eaten upon is a Table; what serves to both, answerable to its double Use and Respect, is either or both, Altar and Table; which is the Case with us. The Name that we give to the holy Sacrament, viz. *the Lord's Supper*; speaks our Sense of its being a Table; as it answers the Name *Supper*; it is call'd a Table, in the Office of its Celebration; the *Lord's Table*, *this thy Table*, &c. its usual Name is not only the *Communion Table*, but every Body sees that it is a Table in all our Churches; and yet to call it an Altar, I take to be neither Popish nor Superstitious, and those who absolutely deny it to be so, to be equally superstitious with those who insist on its being called by that Name only. St. *Aug.* de civit Dei, *de altari Sacramentum sumere, to receive the Sacrament from the Altar*; so far as Prayer, Praise, and Thanksgiving, doing good and communicating, are allowed to be Sacrifices, so called in Scripture by the Apostle in this very Chapter, shewing that it was with respect to those Sacrifices that he gave the Name Altar, v. 15. *by him let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually*; as well as in our Liturgy; as they frequently are, so far as *offering Presentives, and devoting ourselves to God, our Souls and Bodies, are a reasonable holy and lively Sacrifice*; always particularly ascribed to this Duty; so far the Sacrament has been called still a Sacrifice, and the Lord's Table an Altar; and as the original Greek signifies an Altar to be sacrificed upon, (*θυσιαστήριον*) so far they not only justify calling it an Altar, but Propriety of Speech obliges us to give it that Name, as a correlate to Sacrifice; and his Lordship's Reason why he would have it called a *Table*, because it is a *lower Name*, and not an *Altar*, as

too *high* and good a Name for it ; is a Reason why the Name *Altar* should be kept up, because it is the higher Name ; which certainly ought to be given to that on which more excellent Things are offered than ever were on any other Altar.

The Author to the *Hebrews* is so superstitious, as to say (*Chap. xiii.*) that *we have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat that serve the Tabernacle* ; the Name Altar therefore is not a superstitious, but a Christian Name for something amongst us ; for thus far the Text is plain, and we are sure, that an *Altar we Christians have* ; from which Altar *we* eat too, and the *Jews* have no right to eat : and the only doubt is therefore, which is this Altar of ours ; what it is with us that answers to what was so called by the *Jews*. And when his Lordship has used all his Dexterity to settle this Point to his Mind ; the Text left to speak for itself, without any Interpreters, or against all Interpreters, if all were, as his Lordship too positively and largely affirms, against it, will point to that which stands in his Lordship's Eye, at the East End of *Winchester Cathedral* ; or what any where the Lord's Supper is celebrated upon ; which his Lordship seems to think *obscure*, because it too plainly and directly points to that which he is resolved shall not be understood by it. And his Lordship's asserting, that *there is not one Interpreter, ancient or modern, of great Note, who interprets this Passage of the Lord's Table, and that there is not one good Reason for such Interpretation, but many against it*, is a Mistake. Those of the *Romish* Communion may perhaps not be reckon'd as Interpreters of any great Note, whose Interpretations, as prejudiced Men, are to go for nothing, as being in Favour of their Transubstantiation ; and 'tis well if those in the other extreme, are not influenced by partial Affections ; however

however for the sake of other Authorities, and Persons, that they mention, to shew that his Lordship went too far, in asserting that *not one Interpreter ancient or modern, understood this Passage of the Lord's Table*; I will transcribe somewhat I find. *Cornel. a lapide* says upon it,

Altare scilicet in quo offerimus sacrificium corporis & sanguinis Christi, olim in cruce immolati quod edunt & participant non Levitæ & Judei, sed sacerdotes & fideles Christiani, dum sumunt sanctam Eucharistiam, sive ut gratiam cor stabilientem, de qua dixit Apostolus versu precedenti, consequantur, qui eos vivificet in eternum. Ita Chrysost. Theod. Theoph. Anselm, Sedulius, Haymo. &c. quod enim Apostolus non loquatur de altari crucis ut volunt heretici, sed Eucharisticæ & missæ, patet ex verbo habemus; altare enim crucis non habemus sed habuimus, ex altari enim crucis non edimus, sed ex altari Eucharistiæ, &c.
An Altar, that is, on which we offer the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, offered heretofore upon the Cross; which not the Levites and Jews, but Christ's Ministers and faithful Christians eat, whilst they receive the holy Sacrament, to this end that they may obtain that Grace, establishing the Heart, which the Apostle mentioned in the Verse before, that may enliven them to Eternity. Thus Chrysostome, Theodoret, Theophylact, Anselm, Sedulius, Haymo. For that the Apostle does not speak of the Altar of the Cross, as Hereticks would have it, but of the Eucharist, is plain from the Verb, we have; for we have not the Altar of the Cross, but had it only.

And adds, — *in ecclesiâ omni seculo fuerunt altaria, eorumque patres omnes meminerunt; there were Altars in the Church in all Ages, and all the Fathers mention them: and we allow that the Fathers called it indifferently Table or Altar. In Pool's Synopsis, a Commentator, one or more, referred to by the*

Letters, (2. in E.) gives it as his first Opinion, *Per altare hic intelligit mensam dominicam, ex quo Christi corpus & sanguinem sumimus*; by an *Altar* he here means the *Lord's Table*, from which we receive the *Body and Blood of Christ*. And I believe all his Commentators of Note, that oppose the *Lord's Table* being called an *Altar*, will be found to be Moderns only; and *Calvin* and *Beza*, some of the first, whom others follow as in a Track, speaking rather their Sense than their own, as is the common Case with Commentators. *Beza*, I think would restrain the (*we*) to the Christian Ministry only, exclusive of the Laity; and by *Altar* would have meant the Oblations, &c. which they live upon; but this his Lordship thinks not worth notice, though seeming not averse to understand any thing but the *Lord's Table* by it, upon the hardest Terms.

Sometimes, because Christ himself is the *High Priest*, the *Sacrifice*, and the *Sacrificer* too of himself; the *Altar* that is here spoken of must be interpreted to be the *Cross*; and the *Cross* indeed as Christ was offered upon it, may be so far called an *Altar*; and so indeed several do understand it: But then it cannot be the *Altar* in this Passage, which we have, and eat from; for a *Table* his Lordship has told us, and not an *Altar*, much less a *Cross*, is proper for us to eat from: and what we are to eat from it, viz. Christ himself, his Lordship will not approve.

Some of the *Greek Interpreters*, he says, understand this Text of Christ himself; whom they speak of as the *Christian Altar*, upon which all our *Sacrifices of Prayer and Praise* are offered to God. The *Greek Interpreters*, and indeed the *Fathers* in general speak of a *Christian Altar*; and in some Sense they represent Christ as an *Altar*; but then it is not such an *Altar* as is here mentioned, which is to be eat-

en from, much less to be eaten himself; for Altars themselves, his Lordship has observed, used not to be eaten from; and much less to be themselves eaten; and offering Prayers upon Christ, is very uncouth Language; besides, the Altar of the Text is not so called from our offering upon it, but from our eating from it. *There is a double Figure here, says Pareus, (Heb. xiii.) Altar is put for the Sacrifice upon the Altar, by Synecdoche; and the Sacrifice is put for Christ; but this establishes what he would contradict; for that which Christ is called an Altar by a double Figure from, must be more properly an Altar, than what it translates its Name upon. The Altar, says Dr. Whitby, signifies the Sacrifice offered upon the Altar, is plain from this, that of this Altar they were to eat; but he strangely mistakes the Particle, of, in the Text, (which is a Preposition, and means, from,) to be a Sign of the Genitive Case; and what he fancied made it plain, that the Altar signifies the Sacrifice offered upon it, because they were to eat of it; makes it plain that it does not signify the Sacrifice, because they were to eat of, that is, from it; for instead of eating of the Sacrifice from the Altar, he makes them eat a Piece of the Altar from the Sacrifice. When his Lordship has stript Interpreters and Fathers of all both Authority and Importance, (Prop. 5.) methinks he should not give himself the Trouble to quote them here, and elsewhere, where he can pick up from them what is for his Turn. If Altar is a Name of greater Dignity than Table, why should not his Lordship in a sound Sense permit the Lord's Table to have the worthier Name, but scuffle so earnestly as he does, by strain'd and unsatisfying Constructions, to destroy that Share of Title that Altar has in it?*

The truth is, the vain and needless Fears of Superstition have in some Cases driven us into as
great

great Superstitions, as those of the Papists we fly from; and our anti-superstitions are as ridiculous as their Superstitions. They think dangerous Superstitions to be innocent: We, to fly far enough from them, think innocent Things to be dangerous Superstitions. The Bigotry of those on both Sides of the Question amongst ourselves run heretofore to that Height, that they were almost equally to blame; loading each Name, *Table* and *Altar*, with scurrilous and reproachful Nick-Names. Those who contended for its being called an Altar, calling it instead of *Table*, a *Dresser*, a *Tressel*, an *Oysterboard*; the Elements, *Baker's Bread*, *Ale Cakes*, and *Tavern Tokens*; whilst they were paid back from t'other Side in the same Coin, with the Sacrifice of the *Halter*, *Jack in the Box*, &c. Since the thing is set right, I think each Name may be left in Possession, so far as Scripture, Fathers, and Interpreters, so fairly set us Examples.

Albertinus (Lib. 1. cap. 24. de Eucharist.) gives us his Lordship's Argument from Remembrance in its full Strength: *Memoria est tantum rerum absentium ac preteritarum, non presentium, &c.* Originally from *Aristotle*, *Presentium memoria non est, &c.* Memory relates not to present things, and Remembrance is only of things absent or past, not of present things. From whom 'tis not impossible, but his Lordship might condescend to borrow it; but *Albertinus*, after he has made the best of it, is far from thinking it such a demonstrative one, that alone is to be trusted to; or were it so, yet it is too philosophical for those unlearned Persons, for whose use his Lordship produces it. Besides, his Lordship overloads his Argument from Remembrance here, and heaps too many Conclusions upon it. With it he destroys *Transubstantiation*;

with it he overthrows the Notion of a *Sacrifice*, of an *Altar*, and of a *Cross*; the Absence of all which he would have equally implied in Remembrance of Christ. Supposing Christ himself to be really and bodily present at the Administration of the Sacrament, and the very Cross itself on which he suffered; can his Lordship really think that remembering his dying heretofore upon that Cross, would be absurd and impossible, because of his, or its being present? Supposing Christ vouchsafing to descend bodily from Heaven, and to stand visibly in the midst of an Assembly of the Faithful, as he did in the midst of the Apostles, met perhaps to discharge the Duty of receiving Bread and Wine in remembrance of him, as he has commanded; must he necessarily in such Case be desired to withdraw, because they could not in such Case discharge the instituted Duty of remembering his dying for them. Or supposing the very Cross itself, on which he suffered, preserved and present, where the Sacrament was to be administered; would it sound well for his Lordship, or any other strong Reasoner, being one of the Congregation, to stand up and say; *Here, take away this Cross, there is no remembering Christ's dying upon it, whilst it stands here?* Such supposed Presence of Christ would effectually confute Transubstantiation, as his Body could not be in several Places at once; but I see no Inconsistency of his Presence, with the Duty of remembering his having died for us.

P R O P. XI.

Christians meeting together for religious Worship, and eating Bread and drinking Wine in Remembrance of Christ's Body and Blood, and in Honour to him; do hereby publicly acknowledge him to be their Master, &c.

R E M. Allowed.

The

The next Text, which his Lordship explains by a Paraphrase, is 1 Cor. xi. 27, 28, 29, &c. and is St. Paul's Direction for the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper, by a Man's examining and judging himself beforehand; with the terrible Consequence of unworthy receiving, viz. *Damnation* to a Man's self: From which he draws some Propositions. As

P R O P. XII, XIII.

To shew that the Examination required, is not of that long and tedious Nature, as to be a *just Pretence* for a serious Christian's not coming to it, or to be *uneasy* at their honest Performance of it; and that a true Christian needs not any length of Time to assure his Heart of being prepared, and of not coming to it unworthily.

R E M. As to which I am entirely of Dr. Stanhope's Mind, *that he that leads a good Life is never unprepared to receive the Sacrament.*

P R O P. XIV, XV.

It is evident from the Passage now before us, that the whole Affair of eating and drinking unworthily in St. Paul's Sense, is confined to the Frame of our Minds, and our Behaviour at the very time of the Performance of this religious Duty.

R E M. The measure and degrees of Preparation depend so much on the Circumstances of Persons and Occasions, that the same common Rules cannot be prescribed always to all Men; and I do not perceive that it is so evident from this Passage of St. Paul, that an *extempore* and instantaneous Preparation, at the very time of performing the Duty, ought to be encouraged, as a Rule prescribed by St. Paul, or as a Method of Choice, where Leisure and other Circumstances admit of previous

previous Reflections; especially since our Church, besides the immediate Preparation at the Time of Receiving, by solemn Warnings, appointed to be given beforehand, supposes St. Paul's Duty of Examination not to be wholly confined to the very time of Performance.

P R O P. XVI.

He only ought to be affrighted at the Words of St. Paul, because he only in the Apostle's Sense, can be said to eat and drink unworthily, who without considering the Duty he professes to perform, without a serious Regard to the Remembrance of his Lord and Master, for which only it was commanded; eats this Bread and drinks this Wine, either with no thought at all of the End of this Institution, (which is one degree of doing it unsuitably to the Nature of the thing,) or (which is worse) with Thoughts and Behaviour utterly inconsistent with the Design of this holy Rite, or with a Christian's Duty at any time.

R E M. It is his Lordship's own Remark, (p. 108.) that the Church of *England* has so fully and particularly, in her Catechism, in the Exhortations to the Sacrament, and in the Communion Service itself, explain'd the Duty of Examination and Preparation to the Sacrament, and the Nature and Condition of worthy and unworthy receiving it; and the Explications again of the Churches so full and particular Explications are so numerous, and from so many and eminent Hands; that these so particular Explications of his Lordship's may not, according to his own just Observation, be so much wanted; whilst others will be apt to censure his Lordship (since the Clergy of the Church of *England* are obliged by the Law to give solemnly their assent and consent publickly to the Churches Explications) for paying so little Regard to the Churches Conditions of
worthy

worthy receiving the Lord's Supper; which consist of these three particulars; *Repentance, with a stedfast purpose of a better Life; a lively Faith; and an universal Charity.* (Exhort. and Catech.) Since I do not perceive that his Lordship makes one of these particularly necessary to worthy receiving; *Faith*, especially; that Fundamental, not only of worthy receiving the Sacrament, but essential to the Acceptability of all Duty whatsoever. Instead of his Lordship's inculcating and insisting upon it, particularly according to its Dignity, and absolute Necessity set forth in the Scriptures, by our Church in her Articles, Homilies, and Offices, his Lordship takes as little particular Notice of it, as a Religion of Nature Man would of a positive Duty; nor are *Repentance* and *Charity* urged as Conditions beforehand; nor otherwise than as consequentially they may arise afterwards as natural Effects from the Duty discharged. And the vilest Sinner, but nicking the essential Point of Remembering Christ as he puts the Elements into his Mouth, without *feeding upon him in his Heart by Faith, with Thanksgiving*; without Faith, without Charity, without Purpose of Amendment for time to come, or Sorrow for what's past, may happen to be a worthier Receiver, than a much better Christian, who with all requisite Preparation happens to fail through involuntary Wanderings and Inattention, at the Instant of the Duty's Discharge in the Point of Remembrance. *The Essence of this Duty*, says his Lordship, *consists in Remembrance of Christ*; and so indeed it might, if Faith, Charity, and Repentance, and every thing else that qualifies a Man for a worthy Communicant, were included in Remembrance; or were it, as his Lordship says, *impossible to partake of the Bread and Wine in Remembrance of Christ, without Faith in him, and Thankfulness to him*, (p. 107.) if that Faith
and

and *Thankfulness* come in due time, and were *previous to the Performance of the Duty*. But though these followed, as his Lordship supposes, by the Duties leading Men to them; yet such could not be called worthy Receivers from the *Tendency of the Act*, and the *Nature of the Thing*, producing good Effects afterwards: Unless the Custom of our Church (p. 91.) by the Minister's delivering the Bread and Wine into the Hands of every Communicant, and calling distinctly upon every Person — to eat the one and drink the other in the Remembrance of Christ; guarded this Rite against all Possibilities almost of any serious Christian's eating or drinking unworthily, or unsuitably to the End of it; for then indeed there is no Occasion for any body to trouble their Heads about it beforehand.

P R O P. XVII.

It is an Employment very proper and agreeable to this Institution, to revive in our Minds upon this Occasion the Force of all those Arguments, upon which we believe in Christ; to own ourselves his Disciples, to confess and heartily condemn all our Deviations from his Laws, &c.

R E M. All this is very proper, it is certain, had not what his Lordship has just said before, made it unnecessary; but when the Custom of our Church has made it almost impossible to eat and drink unworthily, what occasion is there to supererogate, or give our selves unnecessary Trouble, when all is safe without it?

Bishop. Before I proceed, I think this the most proper Place to apply the whole of what I have now laid down concerning the Nature, End, and Use of the Lord's Supper, more particularly to our publick Office of the Communion, in order to adapt it to the Use of such as attend upon this religious Rite in any Church.

— I shall therefore now enter more particularly into the several Parts and Prayers that compose it, in order
both

both to interpret such Passages, (relating to this Institution) as may stand in need of Interpretation; and to lead all Persons concerned to make use of it in the most proper and Christian manner.

R E M. His Lordship having observed, that it may truly be said in general, that the Expressions of Faith, Repentance, Thankfulness and Charity scattered through this Office, are so many, and so full, that no Christian can doubt of their being completely sufficient for all the Purposes of his Attendance upon the Lord's Supper, should there be no Opportunity of his adding any more private to them; looks like Reflection on himself, for adding his own Explications and Additions to what was already so full and completely sufficient for all the Purposes of Attendance upon the Duty; and were there more wanted and more unblameably done, yet I take his Lordship's whole Design to be in itself irregular and unjustifiable; for I conceive that no private Clergyman of the Church of England, be he Bishop or Archbishop, is at liberty, or has any right to draw any Account of the Nature, End, and Use of the Sacrament, or any thing else within the Establishment, immediately from Texts of Scripture alone; or to draw any Doctrines, Duties, or Propositions from Texts of Scripture, relating to those particular Points that are explain'd by the Church; because by their Assent and Consent solemnly given, they have already exercised that private right of judging for themselves, and formally inclosed it in that of the Church, and declared the Church's Explications to be theirs; and all the right they have, is not to explain from Scripture, but to prove, explain, and illustrate the Church's Explications by Scripture; because those Explications so far as they go, are their own; that the Church's Articles, Doctrines, Explications, &c. are agree-

K

able

able to Scripture, and justly drawn from it, to them is Hypothesis ; as to which, if they pretend to any immediate right of Explication, they act a double Part, do and do not stand to their Assents given ; and his Lordship's undertaking to draw *an Account of the Nature, End and Use of the Sacrament, from Texts of Scripture alone*, from which the Church has drawn already such Account assented to by himself ; I conceive to be inconsistent and an irregular Step, however well and rightly explain'd those Texts may be by him ; and however well executed his whole Scheme may be, yet is a Contradiction to his ministerial Character ; all his Lordship's Right that he has left, is to maintain the Church's Constructions, and to explain and illustrate, not the Texts themselves, but the Church's Explications (which are the Texts already explained by himself) by Supplement of farther Explications. But his Lordship not only draws an Account of the Nature, &c. of the Sacrament, immediately from those very Texts which the Church has drawn her legally established Account from ; which Texts he explains and construes into Propositions and Doctrines of Duty which he establishes, new and widely different from the Church's ; but after he has fallen into this Irregularity, *applies here the whole of what he has laid down to our publick Office of the Communion ; in order to adapt (it) the Office as I take it, to the Use of such as attend upon this religious Rite in our Churches.* Thus throwing aside the Church's Explications and Directions, as to the Lord's Supper, as no longer to be the principal Rule to its Members to form their Notions and Practice of this Duty by ; but putting up his own Propositions and Illustrations of them, as their Rule to know their Duty by, and regulate their

their Practice according to ; and teaching them how they are to square the Church's Offices relating to this Institution to his Account, as the Standard of Rectitude, which they are to go by ; not forming his Notions and his Doctrine relating to the Lord's Supper by those of the Church, or by what it teaches and prescribes about it, nor applying his Doctrine to that of the Church in order to its compliance with that, and reconciliation to it ; but in order to the Church's Language and Expressions being made to bend to his ; and to make them speak not their own plain and generally received Sense, but such as may comport with what he has laid down ; shewing Men the way by Samples given, how they may receive the Sacrament according to the Church of *England*, in Words and Sound, but not in Sense, but such as they please to *adapt* to the Expressions. This Project of adapting the Church's Expressions to other Peoples Notions, I confess I have no good Opinion of, or of straining them off from their fair Sense and direct Intention of speaking what they do ; by which means they may be construed and interpreted so as to accommodate them to Notions quite different from those they are designed to convey ; which any private Man thinks to be more truly and justly the Sense of the Texts they are drawn from, than they are ; for such Accommodators, though they may be both right in discharging the Duty according to their Consciences ; and right also in the thing itself, that theirs is the true Meaning of the Texts ; yet they doubly deceive both themselves, in making themselves believe, that this in true Meaning satisfies their Obligation of Conformity to the Church's Doctrines and Propositions, because they have found a Hole to creep out at, by

an Interpretation of the Church's Language, which they fancy it may bear, though not likely to be what it intended ; but which will do, to retain great Advantages and Conveniences attached to the Name and Character of Conformity ; and they deceive the Community and their fellow Members, by making them believe, that they assent to what they do not ; nor do I think that his Lordship is happy in executing his Attempt of reconciling his Account of the Sacrament to the Passages that he puts it in practice upon ; and if the Case was found to stand so, that there was no bringing his Accounts and the Church's conveniently together, but one or t'other must give way, his Lordship in common Decency ought rather to have broke the way on his Side ; and to have suited his Doctrines to the Expressions of the Church, rather than have warped the Church's Language to make it comply with his Doctrines ; or unless he could have moulded his Interpretations of the Passages he mentions, so as to look more easily and less awkwardly his way, he had better to have stuck to the Truth and Justice of his Account drawn from Scripture, and left the Church's Doctrines to themselves to take their consequent Fate, without vainly attempting to draw them under the Patronage of his Propositions.

I shall only instance in some of the Passages ; let the first be that of the *Exhortation*, the Minister that officiates thus says.

Office. Ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour.

This the Bishop thus Paraphrases.

Bishop. That is, you that now remain in the Church with a Design of partaking of that Bread and Wine, which are appointed to be Memorials of the Body and Blood of Christ.

REM. Can any one think that *Communion* means *Memorial*; and that by the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*, and the partaking of what is called so, the Church intended bare *Memorial* only? Or can any one that thinks that it may be so, satisfy himself that that is all the Church meant by it? Let the Expression be never so Figurative, yet was there ever Figure like this, or any Hyperbole or Catachresis in Orator or Poet like it? Bare heightning will not do it, because there is no Likeness or Foundation in the simple Sense of the Word *Remembrance* or *Memorial*, by which it can be carried to be express'd by the *Communion*, or *partaking of Christ's Body and Blood*; which is out of the way of all Trope. Is to partake of Christ's Body and Blood, to partake of nothing? To receive it, to receive nothing really, or adumbrated under that Character? To receive nothing beneficial from Christ, by that *Communion* and Participation, is strange enough; but to receive nothing at all under those Names, makes it a high and extravagant Expression, such as never was heard of without something to support its height.

Office. — *Must consider how St. Paul exhorteth all Men diligently to examine and try themselves before they presume to eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup. For as the Benefit is great, if with a true, penitent Heart, and lively Faith, we receive that holy Sacrament; for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us.*

Bishop. *That is, if we come to it with such Dispositions of Mind as becomes Christians, and are agreeable to this Institution, &c. — We shall then with these Dispositions come to good Purpose; by our Faith*
and

and sincere accepting him as our Master, we shall come up to the full Meaning of that Expression in the Gospel, in which his Followers were called upon to eat his Flesh, and drink his Blood, in a spiritual and religious Sense; embracing his Doctrine, as the Food and Life of our Souls; we shall then be so acceptable to Christ, that we may be said (by a strong Figure of Speech) to dwell in him, and be in us; to be one with Christ, and Christ with us; that is, that Christ and we, to all the Intents and Purposes of true Religion, shall be in perfect Friendship and Union together.

R E M. By the great Benefit of worthily receiving the Sacrament, 'tis plain that our Church here means something done to, or wrought in the Communicant, by Christ, or something given by him, and received from him, peculiarly annexed to it, and proper to the Discharge of this Duty and Service. What this great Benefit thus collated on the worthy Receiver is, is partly here, partly elsewhere, particularly expressed; the Benefit here mentioned, is expressed by *spiritually eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking his Blood*. This so high Expression of Benefit conveyed to us by the worthy Participation of the Lord's Supper, our Church in her Catechism explains by its Effects, *The strengthening and refreshing of our Souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our Bodies are by the Bread and Wine*. This his Lordship, to adapt to his Doctrine of no Benefits proper or annexed to it, paraphrases, by *embracing his Doctrine as the Food and Life of our Souls*. Our Saviour, we must allow, gave Names suitable to the Things he gave them to; and as these were very high and extraordinary Names that he gave to the Bread and Wine, to call them *his Body and Blood*, circumstanced moreover with being solemnly blest before he gave them to his Disciples, and Thanksgiving; so it by no Means comes

comes up to what these so surprising Names, attended with such Solemnity of Action, speak : To call such *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood, embracing his Doctrine*; and he thinks very unworthily, both of the Expression itself, and its Author, for unsuitably applying such astonishing Names to so plain a Matter; besides the Unseasonableness and Impropriety of such high figurative Language to his Apostles; as of the thing itself, with respect to them; they had *embraced his Doctrine, accepted him as their Master before*, and there was no Occasion on that Score to institute such a solemn Rite, either for him to invite them to it, or for them to give Testimony of it to him; nor is it Language agreeable to it, *take, eat, this is my (Body) Doctrine which is given for you*; nor can any Christians indeed come to the Sacrament, in order to embrace Christ's Doctrine, since their having done that before, is what brings them to it. His Lordship indeed had before, in explaining our Saviour's Discourse in the sixth Chapter of St. John, with better Colour said, *that eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood, was only a high Figurative Representation to the Jews of their Duty and Obligations, to receive into their Hearts, and digest his whole Doctrine*, (p. 100.) because the Expression there was not under Confinement to a particular Object, and there was no *THIS is my Body, and this my Blood*, in the Case. And because it was addressed to those who had not embraced his Doctrine: but to interpret here the eating Christ's Body and drinking his Blood, by *embracing his Doctrine*, as a Benefit arising from it, is improper and unseasonable; besides it puzzled me to think how his Lordship consistently with the great Design of his Treatise, that no Benefits were annexed to the Sacrament, could make this, and so many other Advantages

as he here reckons up, attend due receiving; till considering what he says more attentively, I find that he avoids that Inconsistency, with his Doctrine; and does not intend eating Christ's Flesh, as expounded by embracing his Doctrine, &c. as Benefits from receiving the Sacrament, or as a Consequence of the Discharge of the Duty; but as a Benefit which arises from Examination and Preparation for it before hand; *if we come*, says he, *to the Sacrament with such Dispositions as become Christians, and are agreeable to this Institution, &c. we shall then come to good Purpose, &c.* by so coming, but not by any thing received when we are come, or afterwards: so the Bishop and the Language of the Church, that we are to suppose him to be interpreting, speak of Benefit of different origin; the Office speaks of Benefit from worthily receiving the Sacrament; the Bishop of Benefit from worthily coming to it, before it is received; the Office speaks of the great Benefit consequent upon eating Christ's Body, and drinking his Blood, by the Elements duly received; of being thereby united to, and one with Christ; the Bishop turns this to embracing his Doctrine, and coming duly qualified to the Communion Table; which makes us *so acceptable to him, that we may be said (by a strong Figure) to dwell in him and be in us, and be in perfect Friendship with him.* Thus whilst the Church is speaking of one thing, the Bishop would be mistaken to be speaking of the same thing, but means it quite of another; and would have previous Benefit from Intention of Receiving, pass with us for Consequent, upon the Sacrament received.

And I wonder'd indeed, that his Lordship should talk of *embracing Christ's Doctrine*, as a Benefit from the Sacrament received, as if any came
to

to it, that did not do so, before they came there; or as if it were a converse Ordinance, intended for *Jews, Turks, Religion of Nature Men*, and other Infidels to come to, in order to be converted to Christianity; till I considered that he could not consistently with the great End of his Treatise, interpret the *great Benefit* the Office speaks of any otherwise.

Thus when his Lordship says, by a strong Figure of Speech, *we may be said to dwell in Christ and Christ in us, to be one with Christ and Christ with us*; it is not by any Virtue from the Sacrament worthily received, working those happy Unions and spiritual Intercourses between Christ and the Souls of Believers; but by *the proper Employment* before hand, which he speaks of (Prop. 17.) in Meditation, and Reflexion agreeable to the Occasion. For had his Lordship believed, as he effectually assures us that he does not, that any *Benefit, great or small*, was institutionally annexed to, or peculiar to this Ordinance; and as he knows that not only the Church of *England*, but all Christian Churches do, and have believed; he could not have been at a Loss to have told us, what this *great Benefit* mentioned in the Office, particularly was; at least, not as to its general Nature; which he is here adapting to his Doctrine; since the Churches Definition of a Sacrament tells us, that it is *an inward and spiritual Grace given to us*; and in the first Prayer in the Post-Communion, the Petition is, *that all who were Partakers of this holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy Grace and heavenly Benediction*; or have that *inward and spiritual Grace and Benediction, ordained by Christ himself* to attend it, and which he instituted it to convey, in full Measure and large Degree. And strange it is, that his Lordship should so misapply this

L

very

very Petition, founded on Grace supposed to be annexed to it, to prove there is none.

Grace we know is a divine Favour, a supernatural Gift and Largess, freely bestowed, on such Conditions as the Donor and Disposer thinks fit to annex it to; and there are Diversities of these Gifts and Graces St. Paul tells us, and all from the same hand through different Conduits; *Wisdom, Knowledge, Faith, &c.* which the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every Man severally as he will; and in the Gift of some of these, lies the great Benefit, and heavenly Benediction, which his Lordship overlooks, though explaining it to us; in such of them to each worthy Communicant, as is suitable to their particular Wants to profit withal, and to promote their own Salvation, or edify others; not by an instantaneous Alteration, wrought at once upon the receiving the Sacrament, but in Process of Time, happily influencing their Actions and Passions to better Conduct.

It is certainly very wrong thought in his Lordship, to tie the Conveyance of these supernatural Favours, annexed to arbitrary and institutional Mercies, to natural Causes, as he does, and to account for them that Way; as (p. 106.) when he says, *our Faith in Christ cannot be improved, but either by God's giving us new Evidences of the Truth of his Pretensions* (a very odd Word the last) *or by our own serious Review and repeated Consideration of the old ones.*—*Our Thankfulness cannot be heightened, but by reviving in our Minds the Memory of the Benefits we have received.* Cannot God give, or increase our Faith and Thankfulness by any Means, as well as those his Lordship confines him to, or without any Means at all? Does his Lordship well, in thus taking upon him to tell God which way he must go to work, if he will improve us? Grace would

would be no longer Grace, came it his Lordship's Way. But his Lordship seems to be no great Admirer of the Grace of God, unless coming in some natural Channel, and appearing in the Form of moral Virtue. How laudable his Lordship's Dexterity may be in managing the Interpretation of the Church's high Language, of *Benefit received from eating Christ's Body, and drinking his Blood, by dwelling in Christ and Christ in us*; by making it to amount to no more than coming to the Sacrament like Christians, and embracing his Doctrine, and making it only the Result of previous Disposition; whilst the whole Duty, and all the great Things given out, of Advantages from it, are comprehended in the Act of *Remembring*; and artfully so changing the Place and Time, and Reason of Benefits mentioned by the Church, as to satisfy the Church's Language, and yet adapt it to his Doctrine; Respect both to his Ecclesiastical and Temporal Dignity, forbids me too freely to say.

Office. So is the Danger great if we receive the same unworthily; for then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own Damnation, not considering the Lord's Body; we kindle God's Wrath against us, we provoke him to plague us with divers Diseases, and sundry Kinds of Death.

Bishop. This is taken from St. Paul's Denunciation against the Corinthian Christians; and must be interpreted by it, as I have already fully explained it. (p. 49.)

The Bread and Wine to be eaten and drank in a religious Remembrance of Christ, are here called Mysteries; not in the common Sense of the Word Mystery, as it has been understood to signify either a Thing incomprehensible to our Understandings, or a Matter still hidden from us, &c.

REM. The Greek Name his Lordship knows of Sacraments is (*μυστήρια*) *Mysteries*; which are neither called so from being incomprehensible to us, or hidden from us. For though there may be included in them what is so, yet has that no Share in giving the Denomination; but what is the contrary, known, and comprehended. His Lordship's Notion of a Mystery is not just; for a Mystery is something revealed to us, that could not naturally be known to be so; if it is a Matter still hidden from us, so far as we are not let into it, it is no Mystery to us; and if Men call those Things which they are not let into the Knowledge of, *Mysteries*; they do not call them so, with respect to themselves, and their own Ignorance, but to the Knowledge of some others who are initiated into them; so far as Men are *mystic*, admitted into Secrets, so far, and to them only, those Secrets (*arcana*) are *Mysteries* to them. Thus the Heathen *Mysteries* of *Ceres*, *Bacchus*, &c. were no *Mysteries* to those who were not initiated into them, but were called so only by others, with respect to those who were. If it is revealed to us that such a Thing is so; this Truth so far as 'tis revealed, is a *Mystery*; but whether the Matter of it is comprehensible or incomprehensible, makes it neither more or less properly to be so; which implies only the, *ἔν*, as they call it of the Matter made known, and not the *ἔξ* or Solution by the manner declared why it is so, or how how it is so, made out to us.

But the Incomprehensibility is quite out of the Notion of *Mystery*; yet I am sorry his Lordship finds fault with *the common Sense of the Word Mystery on that Account, as signifying a Thing incomprehensible to our Understandings*; because it seems to reflect on an essential *Mystery* of the Christian Religion,

ligion, which is often struck at for falling under that Character; because God has not with the general Truth revealed, explain'd and declared to us the particular Manner how it is so; reserved to a happier Estate of perfecter Knowledge. Under which Objection, were it just, several other fundamental Articles of our Faith also fall. The *holy Incarnation* of our Saviour is declared by our Church to be a *Mystery*; which his Lordship I hope believes, without insisting upon his comprehending the Manner of. And if the Truth of Things revealed were not sufficient Ground of Faith, without the common Body of Mankind, to whom they are propounded to be believed, understanding the Manner how all the *great Mysteries of Godliness* revealed, come to be true; which are to common Minds as unintelligible as the Doctrine of the Trinity is to our high Rationalists; were they equally scrupulous in insisting on Satisfaction to be given to their Faculties that way, their Infidelity would be as justifiable, and their Faith as irrational, through all the Articles of the Apostles Creed, as they pretend theirs would be, by believing the *Athanasian*.

If Mankind assents to the Truth of Propositions, in Religion, or out of it, were to be proportion'd to their Comprehensions of the Manner how they come to be true, and not to the Authority of the Revealers, very little would be assented to by the greatest Part of Mankind, in Religion, or out of it. Not only the particular Fundamentals of the Christian Religion, but the common Foundations of all Religion, could not be believed or assented to; which are almost all of them *incomprehensible to our Understandings*; and even his Lordship, with all his vast Comprehension and Penetration would be found to be an arrant Infidel, even in natural
Reli-

Religion; and his *Reason* would hardly, without some Resignation, surmount all the Difficulties of believing Christ not to be an *Impostor*. Who can comprehend God? Who can comprehend his Infinity, Eternity, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Omniscience, or indeed any Thing that all Mankind believe of him? Who can comprehend the Creation of the World, or its future Dissolution? Who can comprehend the Providence of God in the Government and Administration of the World and human Affairs? The Resurrection of the dead, or its Manner; how in a Moment, in the twinkling of an Eye, all living Men shall be changed without dying, and the dead raised incorruptible? Are not these and many more common Principles of Religion, and Articles of our Faith, *Mysteries* yet incomprehensible? Truths firmly assented to, without understanding which way they are or possibly can be so.

It is his Lordship's confining his Faith to his Comprehension, that in this his Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament, has produced those dangerous Effects of his Fallibility in it, to himself and others; his refusing to give his Assent to the *ipse dixit* of his Master, without a fuller Satisfaction given to his Reason, and laying open to his Capacity the Manner how the Truths propounded to be believed came to be so. But whether Christ is in the wrong, for imposing the Duty of Belief, without letting such great Persons as — more fully and distinctly know more of the Matter; and how the Truths propounded come to be so, I leave to himself to clear up, and satisfy his Lordship in at last.

As natural Means and Causes produce natural Ends and Effects; so instituted Means and Causes, produce instituted Ends and Effects; and if what his Lordship calls Charms,

were divinely instituted, they would as regularly and properly produce the Ends and Effects with which they have no natural Connexion, as natural Causes do theirs. And his Lordship asserting the Sacrament to be a positive and instituted Duty; that is, to be the Cause and Means of Ends and Effects, out of the Course of Nature, and beyond its Laws; should not measure the Ends and Effects of this instituted Cause and Means, by those of the natural Causes that happen to be the material and instrumental Subjects of the Institutional. Hence his Lordship will allow no Benefits to arise from this instituted Means, but what the natural Tendency of the Elements, or the Circumstances of the Action, are apt to produce; when not one of those Advantages which his Lordship takes Pains to shew, may be derived from receiving the Sacrament, are any of the Ends for which it was instituted, and those only, or none, are so, which he denies to belong to it. And whereas he says, we cannot partake of it, as a Thing (or Mystery) incomprehensible to our Understandings, it is in that Sense only that we do partake of it, that is, of an instituted Cause and Means, ordained by Christ himself, to convey Grace and divine Favours to us, which has no natural Relation to, nor are we able to comprehend which way it is done; only this its institutional Nature assures us of, that it is absurd for us, to think of any spiritual Benefit from it, by the Laws of Nature; and all other ways, but by those Laws, are equally incomprehensible to us; it is to forget its being an institutional Cause, to think of its *leading* us to spiritual Advantages by natural Connexion with them.

The Bread and Wine, says his Lordship, are called *Mysteries* here, either because they mystically

cally (that is, covertly, and figuratively) represent to us the Body and Blood of Christ. There is a great Difference between *covertly* and *figuratively*; but for neither reason are they Mysteries; nor are they the Mystery alone, but together with the concomitant Circumstances that the Duty consists of; and so far only are they part of the Mystery, as they are plainly revealed to us to be the Body and Blood of Christ, and under that Character to be received; but whether *covertly*, or *figuratively*, or by what manner incomprehensible to us, they are *verily* and *indeed* so, is no part of the Mystery.

Bishop. *A short Prayer is then put up, in which all in the Congregation first acknowledge themselves unworthy of God's Favour, and profess their Dependance upon his great Mercy, for their acceptance, and then adds this Petition,* " Grant us therefore gracious
 " Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son, and
 " to drink his Blood, that our sinful Bodies may
 " be made clean by his Body, and our Souls
 " washed through his most precious Blood, and
 " that we may evermore dwell in him and he in
 " us."

This is all express'd in the figurative Manner; but the meaning of it in plain Words is this: Grant, &c.

REM. *All in the figurative Manner;—and yet his Lordship so quick and positive, in giving it us off-Hand in plain Words. Some of it may be figurative, but all is too much; but be it all figurative, it ought to check Men's being too hasty and confident in their Explications of the true and full meaning. Figures cast a Shade, and have something dark and obscure in them, which ought to make an answerable abatement in the Assurance of the Expositor.*

Bishop. *Our Bodies are made clean by Christ's Body, and our Souls washed through his most precious Blood;*

Blood ; by our being influenced by his Doctrine to obey all God's Laws, and our eating and drinking in Remembrance of his Body and Blood, tend to procure us this cleanliness and washing, i. e. all that is meant by these figurative Words—They who embrace an obscure Notion of any other sort of cleansing and washing from this holy Rite, seem to me to delude themselves, and to expect from it what our blessed Lord never annexed to it.

R E M. However our Saviour's Expression of *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*, may be interpreted to signify *embracing his Doctrine* in the 6th of St. John, yet I cannot see by what Figure it can signify so in receiving the holy Sacrament, to which none are presumed to come, but those who embraced his Doctrine already; and by what Figure our Bodies being cleansed by Christ's Body, and our Souls washed by his most precious Blood, should signify our being influenced by his Doctrine so plainly; and, all that is meant by these Words, so that all that embrace an obscure Notion of any other sort of cleansing must delude themselves; unless they come into, and rest in his Notions, I cannot imagine. I think embracing Christ's Doctrine, is a more obscure Notion of eating Christ's Body and Blood in this Place, than any that he reflects upon for being so; and being influenced by his Doctrine, still a more obscure, and far-fetched Notion of being washed and cleansed by his Body and Blood; and if all are deluded that have a different Notion of Washing and Cleansing from this of his Lordship, the Church is not only deluded, but the Scripture deludes it, and us all; that makes frequent use of this same Figure of Washing and Cleansing, in a Notion quite different from his Lordship's, but never in his; and sometimes in Prayer too; for Example, David prays God to wash him thoroughly from his Iniquity, and to

M

cleanse

cleanse him from his Sin; Pſal. li. 2. and ver. 7. Thou ſhalt purge me with Hyſſop, and I ſhall be clean; that is, with the Blood of the Paſchal Lamb alluded to, which was a Type of Chriſt's Blood, which by a Bunch of Hyſſop was ſprinkled on the Poſts of the *Iſraelites* Doors, and which was alſo uſed in cleaning Lepers; does his Lordſhip think that by this *Waſhing and Cleaning him from his Sin and Wickedneſs*, all that David meant was *influencing him to embrace his Doctrine*? Is not Remiſſion of Sin, both as to Guilt and Punishment by expiatory means, plainly meant by him? Does he not plainly pray to be purified, to be ſanctified, to be juſtified, by the deterſive Virtue of the Blood alluded to, as inſtituted Means to purify a corrupted and vitiated Nature and Conſcience from its original, or contracted Turpitude? Is it by influencing us to embrace his Doctrine only, that *the Blood of Chriſt cleanſeth and purgeth us from all Sin*? Is there no Satisfaction given to divine Juſtice, nothing done by the Lamb of God taking away the Sins of the World by Redemption, but influencing us to embrace his Doctrine? When our Saviour waſhed his Apoſtles Feet, was all it meant *influencing them to embrace his Doctrine*? Did it not plainly import a real, if not ſubſtantial refinement from evil and corrupt Affections, wrought in them through that mediatory Rite. *As the Blood of Bulls and Goats ſanctified to the purifying of the Fleſh, ſo does the Blood of Chriſt purge our Conſciences from dead Works*; to be cleaned and waſhed by the Body and Blood of Chriſt, is to have our Souls and their Faculties, the Principles and Instruments of Action and Paſſion, ſanctified by a ſpiritual Grace inſtitutionally attending the due Receiving thoſe more than Representatives of Chriſt's Body and Blood, to which the Scrip-
ture

ture constantly ascribes that Effect; and the Prayer, under Consideration, is, that what Christ himself calls his Body and Blood, received as he has commanded, may justify us from the guilt of Sin contracted, by that Remission which himself annexes to it, (*Matth. xxvi. 28.*) may clear our Faculties and Affections from such Impediments as indispose and disable us to good Actions, and effectually work in us all those good Effects, by Virtue supernaturally exerting itself at the worthy Discharge of this Duty, as may make us acceptable to God. And if the Christian Sacraments have no spiritual Benefits annexed to them, they are inferior to those of the *Jews* which had; that yet were but Types and Shadows of ours, for they did all eat the same spiritual Meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, (for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ) who followed them, eating Manna, and drinking Water from the Rock; but his Lordship would have him forsake us, eating and drinking what has a much juster Title to his Presence, and to be better than the Bread the *Jews* had given them from Heaven, and more spiritually efficacious.

The Prayer called the Prayer of Consecration follows next.

R. E. M. Called, is a Supplement of his Lordship's added to the Rubrick.

The solemn Consecration both of Persons and Things, being so much used in Scripture, and his Lordship having undergone so many, without Scruple or Uneasiness, and performed so many, I hope he is not by the Discovery of any latent Superstition in the Name or Thing, out of conceit with it at last; otherwise adding the Word, *called Consecration*, might look in another Person,

like a glancing Reflection upon the Name, as a Word of religious Pageantry; or on the thing itself intended by it, as without Efficacy, as a Jewish or a Heathenish Ceremony; and so on the Compilers and Establers of the Office itself, as giving a Name to an Action, and the Subjects that it is employed upon, that they do not really deserve, and which ought not to be given.

The term *Consecration*, not only in the Title to this Prayer, but in the Rubricks of the Office, is four or five times more made use of, and not seldomer in the *Office* of ordering or consecrating Archbishops and Bishops, which aggravates a Slight upon it; and I refer it to his Lordship, whether his Supplement in the same way made use of, would sound respectfully, either to the Legislature, the Church, or his Lordship; by one that should say, that his Lordship by a *Consecration called*, is a Bishop *called*; or, as a Body may say; whether it does not insinuate Reproach on the Subjects 'tis applied to, as not really or properly what they are called?

Consecration, in Greek, *Sanctifying*, is setting aside and separating something from common use, to a religious.

Thus in the Office of Baptism; *Sanctify this Water to the mystical washing away of Sin.* And in the Prayer before; *who by the Baptism of thy well beloved Son Jesus Christ in the River Jordan, didst sanctify Water,* (Old Office, the Flood Jordan, and all other Waters) *to the mystical washing away of Sin.* And *Matth. xxiii. 16, &c.* where our Saviour not only admits immediate Consecrations, but mediatory and secondary Consecrations from the first, by vicinity and contact; the *Temple consecrated the Gold, the Altar the Gifts upon it*; and *Grotius* observes, that by the Law, whatever but touched

touched the Altar was consecrated; and I hope his Lordship does not keep Chaplains to do their Office daily at Meals, for Form and Decency, but that his *Bread and Wine, &c. may be sanctified by the Word of God, and Prayer, for the strengthening and refreshing of his Body*, however light he makes of Consecration, as to spiritual Effects. Which yet must be done by Virtue supernatural, if at all.

Consecration therefore, is not conversive, by changing the accidental, much less substantial Nature of Things, in themselves, or altering their essential or natural Forms; as to which they continue the same things after Consecration that they were before; but it is changing only, or giving them new Relations, as to their Use; giving that an immediate, positive Relation to God, which had no such before it was consecrated; thus a Temple consecrated, is the same Building it was before; a Bishop consecrated, is we find the same Man still that he was before; and Bread and Wine consecrated, changes not its Nature, but is the same Bread and Wine that it was before; but the Building by Consecration becomes a Temple, and set aside for the publick Worship of God, demands a Respect suitable to that Relation from Men; and from God may justly be presumed to have annexed to it, in consequence of that Relation to him, such Privileges, as may encourage the due Discharge of proper Respect paid to it on his Account; as by a more immediate Presence hearing Prayers there made to him; and accepting acts of Worship there paid to him, in discharge of the Duty of their Respect to it, from its more immediate Relation and Dedication to him. A Bishop is the same Man he was before his Consecration to that Dignity,
but

but the change of the State of his Relation to Christ, and his Church, makes answerable Degrees of Reverence and Respect due to him from those to whom it belongs; and Christ on his part spirits his official Acts, with those Virtues annexed to them, as make them effectual to all those good purposes to those they are exercised towards, that were the ends of his instituting that high Office, for the edifying of the Members of his Church. Thus the Bread and Wine consecrated, is the same natural Bread and Wine that it was before; but the change of its instituted Relation after its Consecration to those that worthily receive it, as it calls for a distinguished Veneration from the Receivers, so on Christ's Side cannot it be supposed not to convey with it, to those that faithfully partake of it, Virtues and Graces becoming the high Name and Character that the divine Institutor himself stamped upon it. For can it be reasonably thought, that what he called his Body and Blood, though representatively only to be so eaten and drunk in Remembrance of him, by his so special Command, should be so destitute of all the Virtues and Effects of what they are called, *viz.* Sanctification, Justification, Remission of Sin, Renovation of decayed Virtues, &c. as to be spirited with none of them, to vindicate the Propriety of their Name, as not to work some Effect worthy the Name and him that gave it? Not by any Virtue essentiated with the Elements, or inherent in them; or any change in their Nature; nor by any Virtue in the Act of the Priest; but as organical Conditions to which for the Consolation of his Members, and the Edification of his Body, he has annexed virtuous Operations immediately from himself; that thro' these appointed means should work happy and
gracious

gracious Effects, where no Bar or Impediment is put into the way by Defect and Indisposition in the Recipients.

Bishop. In this Prayer all the Communicants are taught to say;—Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we, receiving these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy Institution, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood; in which is plainly implied this Doctrine, that to eat this Bread and drink this Wine as becomes Christians, in a religious Remembrance of Christ's Death, is truly and sufficiently to answer the End of the Institution; and also that it may be made a just ground of praying to God as we do here, &c.

R E M. In this Prayer indeed is implied, that Remembrance of Christ's Death is an essential and the fundamental Part of the Discharge of the Duty; but not that it is the whole Design, or sufficiently answers the End of it; but is a Means only or mediatory End; that through that Remembrance we may attain the chief End, which is being Partakers of Christ's Body and Blood, and of the Benefits implied in that Participation; of which Benefits our leading better Lives, as his Lordship mentions, may be the Consequence, but not as a natural Consequence, or as the immediate Effect; for 'tis unreasonable to expect natural Consequences from institutional Causes.

Bishop. After at the Instant of delivering the Bread, he puts you in Mind of your Duty to eat this Bread in Remembrance of Christ's Death; and so after the same Prayer concerning the Blood of Christ. — To these Words therefore attend with an undisturbed and sincere Application of Mind, and you will unavoidably make it your own Act, and say within yourself,

yourself, I eat this Bread only for that Purpose for which it is designed, &c.

This is that personal Appropriation which — is, if I may use the Word, a Sort of Consecration of them, which is the Duty of every Communicant himself; and without which all other Consecrations that have gone before, will do him no Service at all.

R E M. That without the personal Appropriation his Lordship speaks of, essential to worthily receiving the Sacrament, the Receit will do the Receiver no good, that is wilfully negligent in the Duty, but much Hurt, I readily allow; because it does not work physically, nor *ex opere operato*, as the Papists call it; nor by any Virtue lodged in the Elements, or communicated from them; nor does this work any Grace, but the Spirit of God works through their instituted Mediation, and Instrumentality; but that this Appropriation is a Sort of Consecration of them, is not to be admitted; though we add to it all other Qualifications of worthy Receiving, no part of which in any Sense lies on the Receivers Side. And though without worthily receiving, no Consecrations will do the Receiver any Service at all; yet has it not any causal Share in the Consecration at all, which lies on the active, and not on the passive, or Recipients Side; worthy or unworthy Receiving, stands to Consecration, as a good or bad Digestion stands to the nutrimental Virtue in our Food; which it equally conveys, though with contrary Effects, of Health or Sicknes, as the Receiver is disposed.

Nor do I see why his Lordship should ask leave to use that Word, which he is not fond of, for the Act of the People; which he insinuates Reflection upon as a mere empty Name, when the Act of the Priest; this must be a Sort of real Consecration; but that

but that he says not so much for ; but is *Consecration* called only, making the Elements come as unconsecrated from the Priest's Hands to the People, and received accordingly, unless their personal Appropriation, at the Instant of receiving, does it. If our Saviour's Words pronounced by his Minister, as in his Person, over the same Materials commanded to be received, together with the same whole Action which he used, does not amount to a Consecration of them, and thereby raises them to the Dignity of being as he called them, *his Body and Blood* ; and if they come common Bread and Wine till the Receiver appropriates them personally to himself ; I cannot see how the Guilt of not discerning the Lord's Body in them can be incurred, where no such Appropriation is made ; or how the same Appropriation, if 'tis Consecration, upon drinking Wine and eating Bread at a common Meal, or over a Bottle, is different from receiving it at Church ; or what the Priest has to do in the Business, besides being the common Carrier of Bread and Wine, to each Person, in order to their Consecration ; which whether it is done or not done, is much the same, no Benefit being received if 'tis done ; nor therefore any lost if 'tis otherwise.

Bishop. After the Sacrament received — After the Lord's Prayer, the Congregation prays to Almighty God thus — We entirely desire thy fatherly Goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, &c. humbly beseeching thee, that all we who are Partakers of this holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy Grace and heavenly Benediction.

These Things are not spoken of as sealed to us, or produced for us by this single Action of Partaking the Lord's Supper worthily — &c.

R & M. I have heard of few or none of those his Lordship here speaks so much of, who go to the Sacrament with the groundless Dependance of supplying the Defect of a good Life by the Discharge of that Duty; most that go to it with serious Intent, do it to receive Advantages from it to enable them to reform a bad Life, and confirm their Resolutions of leading a better; to make their Faith more firm, and their Charity more fervent; but not to be led to this by natural Tendencies only, consequent upon the Duty performed to that End; but by its strengthening and refreshing of their Souls, by Grace and Blessing conveyed to them, through that its appointed Conduit; by its removing Impediments, and infusing fresh Vigor and Ability to discharge their Christian Obligations; answerable to the Prayer his Lordship is explaining; *which Things are spoken of in it, as sealed to us*; and the Address is to God, by way of Claim of Grace and Blessing from it; founded on Promise, Faith, Hope, and Expectation. *That all we who (now) are Partakers of this holy Communion (just received by us) may find the Accomplishment of our Hopes from it, by being fulfilled with thy Grace and heavenly Benediction (annexed to it) in the amplest Manner, and highest Degree and Measure; of which our Church, (Art. 25.) Sacraments ordained of Christ, be not only Badges or Tokens of Christian Men's Profession; but rather they be certain sure Witness, and effectual Signs of Grace and God's good Will towards us; by which he doth work invisibly in us, and not only quicken, but strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.*

To which add, Homil. 24. these many Expressions full against his Lordship.

Which although it seems of small Virtue, yet being rightly done by the Faithful, it doth not only help their
weakness,

weakness, but strengtheneth and comforteth the inward Man with Peace and Gladness, &c.

Comfortable Medicine of the Soul, marvellous Graces offered and exhibited in that Supper——Will lightly regard them, to no small Offence, or utterly condemn them, to his utter Destruction. Dainties provided for thy Soul——to feed thy inward Man to Immortality and Life——Not to consider the earthy Creatures which thou seest, but the heavenly Graces which thy Faith beholdeth.

Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain Ceremony, no bare Sign, no untrue Figure of a Thing absent.

Salve of Immortality — Sovereign Preservative against Death — A Deifical Communion — Pledge of eternal Life — The Defence of Faith — The Hope of the Resurrection, Food of Immortality — The healthful Grace — The Conservatory to everlasting Life.

— The Faithful see, hear, and know, the favourable Mercies of God sealed, the Satisfaction by Christ towards us confirmed, the Remission of Sin established; here they may feel wrought the Tranquility of Conscience, the Grace of Faith, the strengthening of Hope, the large spreading abroad of brotherly Love, with several other sundry Graces of God.

Wash yourselves with the living Waters of God's Word, whence you may perceive and know both the spiritual Food of this costly Supper, and the happy Trustings and Effects the same doth bring with it.

A heavenly Refection, and not earthy, invisible Meat, and not bodily.

At this his Table, we receive not only the outward Sacrament, but the spiritual Thing also; not the Figure but the Truth; not the Shadow, but the Body; not to Death, but to Life.

Bishop. There is another Form of Thanksgiving——in this, we are taught to say; Almighty and everloving

God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy Mysteries, with the spiritual Food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy Favour and Goodness towards us, &c.

R E M. The Sense and Acknowledgment of Benefits from the Lord's Supper, cannot well be more clearly and fully expressed, than in this Prayer; yet here again, to adapt it to his Doctrine, his Lordship is pleased to say; *that by a strong Figure, they may be said to feed upon the Body and Blood of Christ, as they perform these Actions, believing and receiving Christ, and his Doctrine.* And more directly again; *That neither here is this Grace of God supposed to be a certain and immediate Effect of receiving this Sacrament; but plainly left (as it ought to be) as the Subject of a Christian Prayer, wholly distinct from the Duty of communicating.*

This Prayer begins with a Thanksgiving for the present Benefits just received; mentions them in particular, *feeding us with the spiritual Food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; feeding, certainly in any Sense, speaks a Benefit, especially with such Food; and thereby assuring us of God's Favour; and that we are hereby united to him, and incorporated in his mystical Body; and of being Heirs of an everlasting Kingdom; after which Acknowledgment of Benefits, follows indeed a Petition for such a farther Supply of Grace, that we may persevere, and make good use of the Benefits received already from it.*

P R O P. XVIII.

Whether any Privileges or Benefits are annexed to the partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper, and what they are that are annexed to it, can appear only from the Words of the New Testament itself; or from the real Nature and End of this Institution, and what is necessarily included in it.

R E M. All that his Lordship has been hitherto a doing, has been but as *apparatus* to this last Proposition; and the grand Point of Doctrine, which he has so much at heart, that he propounds it for his establishing of; that is to say, that no Benefits are annexed to the worthy receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; that Christ, for his part, has not design'd it for a Duty to do us any good; but made it an Act of bare Remembrance, without any thing derived to us from him through it; a Memorial of him only; which is the Sum and Substance of his Lordship's Account of its *Nature, End, and Use*; for what is more than this, our Saviour has left it to us to make the most and best of it that we can, every one for himself; and if we escape the Danger threatened from undue Discharge, and turn it to some use to ourselves, by picking out Lessons for moral Improvement, from such Circumstances of it, as may have a natural Tendency to lead us that way, we come off well.

Though his Lordship has built his Treatise after the Geometrical Order; and to make sure Work all the Way as he goes, brings us up from his first Proposition, as an indemonstrable, to this last, every Step as upon Demonstration, by sixteen intervening Propositions, strongly chain'd to each other; yet notwithstanding this Air of Strength, in my poor Opinion, his Lordship ne-

ver

ver gave his Admirers less ground to fix Compliments of strong and close Reasoning upon, than in this upon this modish mathematical Plan.

In order to convince us that no Benefits are annexed to the worthy receiving the Sacrament, his Lordship tells us.

Bishop. *We must seriously consider all the Texts in the new Testament, relating to this Subject, in order to judge whether it has pleased God to annex in express Words, any Promises to this Duty (peculiarly) of partaking of the Lord's Supper; or to declare in express Words any Privileges to belong to Christians for the Sake, or by Means of their Attendance upon it.*

R E M. Whatever Right or Reason his Lordship has to call upon us to produce *in express Words any Promises of Benefits annexed to this Duty, or any Declarations in express Words of Privileges belonging to Christians attending upon it, by Means of that Attendance*; the same Right, with much greater Reason, we have on our Side, to call upon his Lordship to produce, not in express Words (that we will not be so rigorous to stand with him upon) but in Consequence only, any Texts that deny or oppose our receiving Benefits from this Duty; or that forbid, or any way discourage the general Faith and Hope of so doing.

His Lordship does not so much as offer at doing any thing like this, or at giving us any Reasons against it; but the Strength of his Lordship's Evidence against Benefits arising from the Lord's Supper, is only negative.

And lies either *First*, in disqualifying Texts from giving their Evidence in the Cause, and throwing them aside absolutely; and this chiefly upon his own Paraphrases and Explications; that by the Authority of judicious and learned Men,

Men, have been taken not only to relate to the Duty, but to express important Benefits arising as annexed to it; or *secondly*; by invalidating in such Texts, as he cannot deny to have direct Relation to it, those Senses of the Words, and Constructions that have passed down the Christian World for the true and genuine, with little Contradiction, and that from Parties not of the best Note; which import both high Benefits and Privileges attending the Duty.

And as his Lordship well knows, that the Doctrine of Benefits and Privileges from the Sacrament, is, and always has been from the first Ages in Possession; and that his Lordship bringing his Ejectment, ought not only to shew the Weakness of its Title, but by positive Proof to make the Title of his own Doctrine the better; he yet makes no Attempts this Way. Far be it from his Lordship, to strive, as for mastery only, or like an Olympionick, to be crown'd with Garlands of Applause from any Set of People, that as the World goes, are prepared with Acclamations for those who run dangerous Lengths in new and singular Notions in Religion; and yet I am at a Loss to think what Benefit he proposes to the Christian World, by persuading them against hoping for any from the holy Sacrament; and his Lordship will have much ado to clear himself from fighting against, and opposing his private Sense to that not only of the Church that he professes himself, and is so eminent a Member of; which, if its Articles and Liturgy favours his Doctrine of no Benefits from the Lord's Supper, it is what the Generality of the Body have not hitherto been aware or dreamed of; but to the Sentiment of all Christian Churches, that have deserved the Name, both Reformed and Popish; and for whom does he contend,

contend, or what? His Victory should he prevail, would be a melancholy one; or what is he or any Christian to gain by it? Or which way to be the better? All that is to come of his Doctrine at last, is to deprive us of a considerable and innocent Hope; which is some sort of Enjoyment, though it misses of real Possession; and to have Hopelessness in its stead. Could his Lordship prove it sinful to hope for Benefits from the Sacrament, or to believe any Benefits to be annexed to it, he might be in the right to cut off such a sinful Notion; but that is not pretended; and for his Ways of its being *hurtful, or of bad Consequence*; (p. 179.) I think the Reasons stronger on the other Side: For it is not from any Discontent with what Christ and his Apostles have taught them to expect from this Duty, (p. 180.) but from what they conceive they ought to expect, not only from this, but from every other Duty, he has positively enjoin'd; which they would think unworthily of, did they not think them beneficial. And what if it were no better, as his Lordship calls it, *than a Dream, pleasing perhaps at present, but in the End hurtful to those who infuse it into others, and to such who will find themselves disappointed when they are waked out of it*; since they must be waked first out of it, before they are disappointed; why does his Lordship envy them the Pleasure of dreaming on, why must he needs be the Man to hasten the Disappointment, by taking such Pains to bring it upon them?

His Lordship is sensible that he has got on the undesirable side of the Question, and that he is contending against the common Interest and Hope of the Christian World; and against what every one ought to wish were true and real, if it is not so; for thus he is pleased to say.

It

(P. 5.) *It ought to be far certainly from the Thoughts of every Christian, to lessen any Privileges, or undervalue any Promises annexed by Christ, to any Duty or Institution of his Religion; it is an inexcusable Fault wilfully to attempt it; and an inexcusable Carelessness to do it for want of due Consideration; it is a Fault indeed to which no Christian can have any Temptation; all such Privileges and Promises, being of equal Importance to all; and the Nature of them such, as that no one can be so much his own Enemy, as not to be willing to find the Truth and Certainty of them if he can.*

How far his Lordship is chargeable with *this inexcusable Fault*, his Readers will judge; as also how his extenuating this *so inexcusable Fault*, in almost the same Breath; by saying that an *Error of this Sort*, should it be supposed, does not really hurt any Christian, is consistent with its being such an *inexcusable Fault*; as on the other hand his aggravating the Error, of magnifying the uncertain Hopes of Benefits from Christ's Institutions; making it on that Side amount to the *perverting the Design of Christianity*, (p. 6.)

Were his Lordship contending for such important Benefits and Comforts, as those are which he is contending against, the Zeal which he expresses in prosecuting his Cause, would look much better than his labouring so hard as he does, to strip the Christian World of the Hope of all those, tho' but imaginary Blessings and Comforts, and Grace, that full of Faith and Hope, so many truly devout Persons attend this Ordinance with full Dependence of receiving from their Saviour. Does his Lordship shew any Tokens of its being an ungrateful Task to him to do this? Does he like one whom the Love of Truth, and the Power of Conscience, unwillingly constrain'd to this so

unwelcome Undertaking? Does he not beyond Indifferency and Impartiality, take all Advantages, dispute every Inch of Ground, as loth to leave one single Thing standing, that looks in Favour of Benefits from the Lord's Supper? Nay, why should I mince the Matter? Does he not plunge through thick and thin, stick at nothing in his Way, in Scripture and Liturgy, that he can but daub over with Colours at a coarse Rate, to make it look his Way; torturing Texts of Scripture, and putting each Passage in the Offices of the Church to the Rack, to Distortion, till they seem to speak otherwise than the Members of the Community thought they plainly did; by *strong Figures* forcing them so as *they may be said* to bear the Sense of his Paraphrases? And why does his Lordship say, *that whenever he differs from so many and great Men as he does, that it is with so great Concern — and a great Respect towards them; so far from his being inclined to it, or pleased with it, that it would have been a Pleasure to him, not to have found a Necessity of doing it?* When at the same time he says, that his so differing from them, is of *little Importance*; (p. 7.) and in his *Fifth Proposition*, that *it is of small Importance to Christians what any Writers from Christ's and the Evangelist's time, have affirmed upon this Subject.* And where is the *Necessity* that he talks of, for his Writing this Treatise, which is so contrary to his *Inclination*, and gives him *so great Concern*; any more than for my writing my Remarks upon it; which gives me about the same Degree of *Concern* for differing from so great a Man as his Lordship, as his Lordship feels, for *differing*, contrary to his *Inclination*, from the great Men he speaks of? His Lordship endeavours to deprive us of something valuable, which it concerns each Christian to struggle for to
the

the last, and to see otherguess Reasons, than his Lordship has yet offered, before they let it be took from them; or are sweetened out of it by exchange for his moral Equivalents. Could not his Lordship content himself with the Enjoyment of his no spiritual Benefits from the Sacrament, having reaped so large a Share of temporal ones annexed to the Discharge of the Duty? And having got the Bird in hand, leave the *Dream of Grace*, and *supernatural Favours* from it, to those deluded poor Souls, who have no Hopes or Design of reaping temporal Advantages from it.

Could his Lordship make it a clear Case on his Side, and set his Doctrine in such a Light, as must work a general and thorough Conviction; nay could he but make any one of the Texts that record the Institution, or the Passages in the Liturgy, he explains, speak beyond Contradiction for him; as one might expect by his telling us, *that one cannot imagine any positive Institution of greater Plainness and Simplicity*, (p. 22.) it would have been something like: But instead of this, there is not one Text, or one Passage of them, that he tampers with to make Evidence of, that he can work upon to look fully, or easily in his Favour; and left to themselves simple and unpuzzled with his Criticisms, and without his speaking for them in his Paraphrases; and but few Christians, but would hear them as they have done, unanimously giving the same Testimony of Benefits being annexed to the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper.

But to attend his Lordship under this his last Proposition.

Bishop. — I think it just to mention one (Passage) in Regard to the Judgment of some good Interpreters, who think it relates to the Subject we are now

upon, tho' in my Opinion they have not the least Foundation for thinking so.

R E M. Does not his Lordship pay great Regard to the Judgment of these good Interpreters, and are they not good ones indeed, that have not the least Foundation for their Judgment, and thinking as they do?

This Passage his Lordship speaks of, is (1 Cor. xii. 13.) *for by one Spirit are we (or we have been) all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been made to drink into one Spirit.*

These last Words his Lordship observes, have been interpreted to relate to drinking the Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper by some; and in a Note at the Bottom says, See Mr. Lock and others;—and by others to signify the Purification of the moral Fruits and Graces of God's holy Spirit, by means of receiving the Cup in the Lord's Supper. And his Lordship entertains us with a long critical Comment upon it, to shew us, that drinking into the same Spirit, has no relation to the Lord's Supper, or Benefits from it; in which, if his Lordship is right, the Generality of Commentators are in the wrong. That St. Paul's speaking of Gifts and Graces after the Lord's Supper, is introducing a perfectly new Subject; as if Gifts and Graces had no relation to that Duty, is measuring Revelation by the Truth of his own Doctrine.

His Lordship's Distinction between *καρπὸς* Fruits, and *χαρίσματα*, Gifts of the Spirit; that Fruits means moral Virtues, and that Gifts are not of that Number; does not hold good; and though he bids us over and over take notice, that St. Paul mentions none of the moral Virtues amongst Gifts of the Spirit; which he thinks never the better of for that; and moral Virtues must not be Gifts but Fruits of the Spirit; and such Fruits which it is in

every Man's own Power to bear ; as he particularly Instances in *Charity*, the *greatest of moral Virtues*, which he says *St. Paul* distinguishes from *χαρισματα* Gifts ; as not being one of that Number, but a Fruit, *which it is in the Power of all sincere Christians to possess* ; which is a great Mistake, for *St. Paul* makes *Charity* to be a Gift as much as *Faith*, or *Hope*, or any thing else that he had called so. And our Church from him, calls it expressly a Gift. (*Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday*) *Send thy holy Ghost and pour into our Hearts that most excellent Gift of Charity.* If Gifts of the Spirit, and Fruits differ, it is as Cause and Effect. Fruits are the Effects and Produce of Gifts, from him that gives *Grace for Grace* ; and the holy Spirit may make his Gifts Fruits, or Fruits Gifts, as he pleases ; and moral Virtues may be Fruits or Gifts, as mediately or more immediately wrought in us, and given by him.

His Lordship having now finish'd his Evidence against Benefits annexed to the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper, thus sums it up at last :

Bishop. *If we review all the Passages of the New Testament, which I have before produced, we shall find that there is only one of them, which has been supposed by any Interpreters to imply in it, any immediate Benefit or Privilege annexed to this Rite, viz. that of St. Paul, in which the partaking of the Cup and of the Bread at the Lord's Table, is said to be the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. This I acknowledge has been interpreted by many, to signify an actual partaking of (all) the Benefits of his Sufferings and Death.*

REM. If the Partaking of the Lord's Supper, is said to be the actual Partaking of *all* the Benefits of Christ's Sufferings, it is not to be understood of all at once, by all the Communicants at
that

that same instant of Time; it is enough if each Communicant receives immediately from it some; and have thereby their Title strengthen'd to the rest; 'tis enough if they *receive it to their Comfort*; if it weaken in them the Power of any Sin; if it confirm and strengthen in all, or any, Goodness; if it increase in them, Faith, Hope or Charity, give them full Assurances of the Divine Favour, and in process of time afterwards, by happy Influences, contribute by the Amendment of their Lives, to bring them to everlasting Life through Christ, this is enough; but the Partaking of all the Benefits of Christ's Death is reserved for a better Life and State. And our Church saying, that the *Benefit* of worthily Receiving is great; gives it as the Reason that it must be so, *for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood.*

Bishop. *But I have already shewn at some Length, (p. 39.) that the Apostle's Argument in that Place, and his plain Intention in it, neither require nor admit this Sense of the Words; and I was the more solicitous to put this in a clear Light, because I esteemed it of pernicious Consequence to lead Christians to think, that this, or any one single instance of Obedience to the Will of God, however worthily performed — could possibly be to them the Partaking of all the Benefits of Christ's Life and Death.*

R E M. That the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, signifies, *the actual Partaking of all the Benefits of his Death*, is the Language and Doctrine of our Church; who after receiving the Sacrament, directs the Receivers to put up this Prayer, *That we who have now communicated, and thy whole Church, may receive Remission of our Sins, and all other Benefits of his Passion*, consequent upon that Remission, in due time; that is, by the Efficacy

[III]

Efficacy and Fruits of this holy Sacrament, filling us with Grace and Blessing upon our Endeavours.

Nor do I see why his Lordship should esteem it of pernicious Consequence to lead Christians to think that this, or any one single Instance of Obedience to the Will of God worthily performed, should be to them the Partaking of all the Benefits of Christ's Death; if he considers that the worthy Discharge of this Duty, contains all the Conditions to which those Benefits are promised, viz. Faith, Repentance and Charity.

And is it not lawful for God to do what he will with his own; to tie the Receipt of Favours from him to what Conditions he pleases? Who without regard to Habits of Virtue, or Systems of Morality, exercised through a long course of Time, has commonly made Blessing and Cursing, Life and Death, turn upon single Acts of Faith, or Obedience or Disobedience to his positive Commands. Was not the Partaking of all the Benefits of his Favour, put upon one single Act of Obedience to one only Command at first, upon which the Blessing, not only of our first Parents, but of their whole Race depended? Was not *Abraham* justified by Faith, and the divine Blessing, not only of himself, but of his Posterity, and all the Kingdoms of the Earth, ascribed to one single Act of Obedience to the divine Will as its Cause? *Gen. xxii. 16. because thou hast done this (one) thing,—that in Blessing I will bless thee,—and in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the World be blessed; and this single Act of Faith was imputed to him for Righteousness; and by Works, or Acts of Obedience in consequence of that Faith, and in execution of it only? His Morals had no share in the Case, nor all those practical Excellencies that are the true Heights*
and

and exalted Accomplishments of the Christian Life; so called by his Lordship; all which his Lordship has yet solemnly, more than once, declared and given it under his Hand, without Faith have the Nature of Sin; are neither pleasant to God, nor make Men meet to receive Grace, or deserve Grace as the Schoolmen speak of Congruity, (Art. 13.) Did not one single Act of Duty, and that not very consistent with his Lordship's Morality, recommend Phinebaz to the divine Favour? Did not one single Act of Idolatry and Infidelity, without any change in their Morals observed, subject the whole Jewish Nation to present and future Curse? How frequently is the divine Blessing and Curse tyed to single Acts of Obedience or Disobedience? How often for one single Act of Faith are Men said to be saved, to have their Sins forgiven in the Gospels, without all regard had to Morality, or virtuous or vicious course of Life? And let me, with Submission, tell his Lordship, that an Act of Faith executed by worthily receiving the Lord's Supper, in obedience to Christ's Command, is worth a thousand long Lives of Infidel Virtue, by entitling to all the Benefits of Christ's Death, if the Scripture or the Doctrine of the Church of England, is the Rule to judge by. Not that Men are so entitled to the Benefits of Christ's Death thereby, as not to be liable of incurring forfeiture, by falling from Faith, and with it from Grace, (as his Lordship is sensible Men may) by relapsing into the Consequences of Infidelity; but without that, he that imputed Faith for Righteousness to Abraham, will impute it to us, for whose sake it was written, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the Dead, Rom. iv. If with a lively Faith, and becoming Resolutions, we draw near, and receive the Body and Blood of Christ,

Christ, (*the Pledges of his Love, and the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, Rom. iv.*)

His Lordship here proceeds to explain the Answer in the Church Catechism, to *what is the inward Part or thing signified, by the outward and visible Signs; which is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper; which for want of an equitable Explication, he says, are charged with an Absurdity equal to that of Transubstantiation.* That by verily and indeed Transubstantiation is not intended, his Lordship knows; and his Lordship's Business is to show, that by the Faithful's receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, no particular Benefit is express'd, or thereby intended by the Church to be received; his Lordship's equitable Construction is, that we are said figuratively to eat the Flesh, and drink the Blood of Christ, as we take in and digest for our spiritual Nourishment all his Doctrine: Verily and indeed, is truly and really; that is, not figuratively only; instead of figuratively, as his Lordship explains it; nor physically, but effectually, though only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and by means of Faith, (Art. 28.) And if taking in and digesting all Christ's Doctrine for our spiritual Nourishment, were admitted to be what is signified by the eating Christ's Body and Blood, and the Communion of it; yet that still is annexing as great Benefit to it, as those which he is contending against.

'Tis a strange Turn that his Lordship gives to the Answer to the Question, *Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?* In the same Catechism, which is for the continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and the Benefits which we receive thereby. Upon which his Lordship: *We see it is for the Remembrance of all the Benefits which are promised to be bestowed upon us by*

means of Christ; and not for the actual receiving those Benefits, that our Church declares this Rite to be ordained. The Church declares that there are two great Ends for the Lord's Supper being ordained; the one is, *for the continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ*; the other is, *for the Benefits that we receive thereby*; that is, not by the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, but discharging the Duty of remembering that Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. And the Church makes this plain in the following Question, *What are the Benefits whereof we are Partakers thereby?* by receiving the Sacrament, and thereby remembering the Sacrifice of Christ's Death; for *thereby* in this Question, as in the Answer before, plainly relate not to Christ's Death immediately, but to the Duty of Remembrance, through which Christ has ordained the Benefits of it by the Sacrament to be conveyed. And to suppose no Benefits annexed to the receiving the Lord's Supper, is to make the Church's Question altogether impertinent: For the Church's Question is not what his Lordship makes a Question of, (*Prop. 18.*) *Whether any Privileges or Benefits are annexed?* &c. but taking it as granted that there are, asks only, *Which are they?*

Besides, Is the Remembrance of the Benefits purchased by Christ's Death, a Reason why we must receive none by doing so? Is it not the most effectual Way to receive more Benefits, to remember those already received? *Reminiscimur ut ampliora consequamur.* (Amb.) We remember Benefits, that we may receive more and greater still. *Efficacissimum genus est rogandi gratias agere,* (Plin. Pan.) The most effectual Way of receiving more, is gratefully to remember those already bestowed. Tho' Christ had instituted no such Duty as this of Remembrance of him in the Sacrament; ought any

any Man to contend that such an Act of grateful Remembrance, without positive Command, would have had no peculiar Reward? And much more such Remembrance solemnized by his almost last Command, with such Circumstances, as that of doing it by receiving what he called his Body and Blood; the Institution itself, and the Graces it is the Means of conveying, may justly be thought none of the least of the Benefits to be remembered. Our Saviour's introducing its Solemnization with such a pathetic Welcome of it; *With desire have I desired* (Luke xxii. 15.) *to eat this passover with you before I suffer*, very ill comports with the Doctrine of no Benefits from it.

Bishop. *Christ, and the Benefits purchased by him, are to be remembered in this partaking of the Lord's Supper; and therefore neither he, nor those Benefits, are supposed to be actually received at the Time, or by the Acts of eating this Bread, and drinking this Wine.*

R E M. This is wonderful Logick to me; if Benefits cannot be received, when or whilst they, or our Benefactors are remember'd; the way to receive Benefits from Christ, were then, instead of remembering, to forget both him and them as fast and long as we could, to make room for actual Reception. Commemorations at that Rate wou'd be mischievous Things, which whilst they lasted made Men incapable of receiving farther Favours, or partaking of those already bestowed. Are the Benefits of Christ's Death to be remember'd only, as past, absent, distant from us? Are they never to be present, and actually received and enjoyed? Which must be the Season for this? Which the Acts from which the actual Participation of them is to be hoped for? If receiving his Body and Blood faithfully and worthily, according to his Institution, and the solemn Remembrance of

his Death, and Benefits from it, naturally incapacitates us actually to receive any of them at that time, when are we to receive them?

His Lordship having hitherto attack'd the Doctrine in general, of Benefits *accruing* from *worthily* receiving the Sacrament; comes now to do it in Particulars, by throwing aside one by one the several Benefits that Divines, and Christian Churches, have thought and believed, were peculiar to the worthy Discharge of that Duty.

But lest he should seem to make altogether a vain and uselefs Rite of it, he asks himself, *what those Benefits and Privileges are, which are truly and certainly annexed to this Duty?* To which he answers; *All that either in general are promised, or naturally belong to a sincere Obedience to any positive Commands of God; or in particular are in the Nature of the Thing implied in this Rite; or result from it; and designs not to exclude out of a Christian's Thoughts and Expectations, any of those Promises which attend upon all Duties of the like Sort; or any of those natural Consequences from this particular Duty, which may be considered as the Promises in Effect of him who made it a Duty.*

R & M. Had his Lordship thought fit to strip the Sacrament of all Benefits, and leave it fairly naked, it would have been better, than by a Shew of making it an Amends by other *true* and more *certain* Benefits, to adorn it with a Set of *Paraphrases* of nothing, as he does here; for such are *all Benefits in general* that are *promised, or naturally belong to Obedience to any positive Commands of God;* which are none at all; *all the Benefits in particular in the Nature of the Thing implied in this Rite;* which again (besides the Virtue the Bread and Wine yields the Body) are none; *Promises of Benefits which attend upon all Duties of the like Sort; which*
are

are none, still meant, *to Rites, as Rites*; for since he denies any Promise to this, I do not see how all, or any other, can pretend to it; if any, it must be Baptism; the great Privilege of which, *a Death unto Sin, and a new Birth unto Righteousness*, he makes to be a *figurative Expression, never made use of to signify any Benefit, or Privilege actually obtained at the time of receiving Baptism*; (p. 150.) *all natural Consequences from this particular Duty, which may be considered as the Promises in Effect of him who made it a Duty*; which are no Promises at all; for who beside his Lordship ever call'd natural Consequences, promised Benefits; or the Uses and Improvements which Men are capable of turning what they are commanded to do to; Benefits and Privileges truly and certainly annexed by Promise by the Commander? Yet it is *these natural Consequences from this particular Duty* ——— and the *natural and reasonable Tendency of it, upon which we ought to found our main Expectations, &c.* ——— *And Tendencies by which the receiving the Sacrament will help us in our Endeavours of reforming our Vices, or increasing in all Virtue*, (p. 157.) which amounts all to this, that our Saviour for his part, has promised nothing at all to the worthy Receivers of the Sacrament, neither will do any thing for them himself, but will let them have all the fair play for it imaginable; he will not stop the Laws of Nature, but let Things take their Course, nor be any Hindrance to them, from making all the Improvements of it that *reasonable Creatures can make in a reasonable way*; and *Benefits of this Sort are of substantial and lasting Service*, (p. 156.) will wear well, and stand by us, *without fancying to our selves Privileges, Communications, or Impressions from above of another Sort*. His Lordship's Reasoning is like that, that a Penny of a Man's own getting,

is better than a Pound given to us. One of those *real practical Excellencies* called *moral Virtues*, which are the true Heights and exalted Accomplishments of a Christian Life, of a Man's own getting, and working out for himself, are better than Faith, and any other Gifts and Graces of God, that come to him as free Gifts and Legacies from Christ; or that are wrought in him by Power divine and supernatural, by Virtue of his Appointments.

I think I mention all that is considerable in his Lordship's Treatise; and omit nothing designedly, that has any new Reasoning in it, to the Advantage of his Cause.

Thus his Lordship argues against the Benefits in particular, that are supposed to be reaped by the worthy Receivers of the holy Sacrament.

Bishop. *To say this Communion is the actual partaking of all the Benefits of Christ's Body broken, and his Blood shed, is to put that upon one Act, which is by our blessed Lord made to depend upon the whole System of all Virtues united: But the present Case has this peculiar Absurdity in it, that in this Rite, which was instituted for the Remembrance of Christ, it destroys that very Notion of Remembrance that is the Essence of it, &c.*

REM. I do not remember that our Saviour has made the Participation of all the Benefits of his Body broken, and his Blood shed, to depend upon the whole System of all Virtues united; or any such Language used by him, as *System*, or *Virtues*, or *united*, either upon this, or any other Occasion, or any thing to that Purpose: But if there is any such Dependence, Virtues rather depend on the partaking of Christ's Body and Blood, than such Participation on Virtues. On Faith indeed, and believing in him, both he and his Apostles, and our Church from them, make all acceptable Service, Justification,

cation and Sanctification, &c. to depend, as their Root and Foundation; to the Increase of which, and making it lively, *the Body and Blood of Christ* worthily received, has, by all Christians, been always thought a Means particularly effectual.

Before those Words, that common Meat was profitable only to nourish the Body, and did minister aid to corporal Life; but after it was said of our Lord, Do this in my Remembrance, this is my Flesh, and this my Blood; so often as it is done with these Words, and with this Faith, that substantial Bread and Cup, being consecrated by solemn Benediction, doth profit to the Life and Salvation of the whole Man. (Cypr. de Coena Dom.)

But I beg his Lordship's Pardon; Authorities are of little Importance to him.

Bishop. *To say that this Sacrament is design'd and ordain'd peculiarly for the obtaining of God's Holy Spirit, is, I think, to forget and contradict those express Words of our Saviour, in which he himself has annexed that Benefit to the Duty of Prayer.*

REM. To annex the obtaining God's Holy Spirit to one Means, is not to exclude all others: Our Saviour conveyed that Benefit by *breathing on his Disciples*, the Apostles by *Baptism*, by *laying on of Hands*, &c. to which supposing Prayer to have been annexed. Prayer not only in the original Institution attended this Duty, but ever since *breaking this Bread and Prayer* have gone together; and the Discharge of this Duty may at least be supposed to make Prayer to that Purpose more effectual; and if Damnation is the Consequence of unworthy receiving, Diseases and Death, and the Devil's *entring into Men as into Judas*; by Parity of Reason, salutary Effects, and the Gifts of the Spirit, ought to be the Consequence of worthily doing it.

Bishop.

Bishop. The Promise of Christ's being in the midst of us, is not peculiar to our Attendance on this Rite, but it belongs to our assembling in his Name — upon this, or upon any other religious Account.

R E M. If the Promise of being in the midst of us, were peculiar to our Attendance on this *Rite*, it would go near to spoil the Solemnity, by his Lordship's Doctrine, which requires rather peculiarly his Absence; though denying his Presence peculiarly to this Rite, is opposing his own to the greatest Authorities, if not to the Scripture itself, which gives us Examples of his being visibly and miraculously present to them solemnizing this Duty.

Bishop. To call it the Food of our Souls, is not to give it a Name peculiarly proper to this, as distinct from all other Points in which we are equally concerned; the Word of God, and Doctrine of Christ; and so may Prayer, and so may every thing else which leads us to a Life of Virtue, by the same strong Figure be stiled — But the Danger of calling this so is the greater, because the Rite itself consisting in eating and drinking Bread and Wine, the Expression is apt to convey the Notion of something mechanically, or miraculously conveyed at the same time into the Soul, which is Food to that, as the Bread eaten is to the Body.

REM. His Lordship has got into an uncommon Vein of Reasoning here; what if a great many Things are called the Food of our Souls; is the Lord's Supper ever the less peculiarly so for that? The same Name may be appropriated to several Things, and yet peculiarly to each; if it is done with different Respects; if in different Degrees of Figurative Propriety; if dependently and in subordination to each other; one principally, emphatically, and glaringly may be so; others faintly, obscurely, and catechrestically. What if a
 perverse

perverse Man to make the Name cheap and common, and vilify the Sacrament, will abuse it by Application to *every thing else*, that poorly or not at all deserves it. Ought this to lessen with us the Dignity of this Benefit of feeding our Souls, or its Peculiarity to the Lord's Supper? And be it common to what it will, I hope it always implies a Benefit annexed to the things so called; which ought not to be denied in a superior Degree to this, that by general Consent has the first and best Claim to it, by more than Figure; whilst other Subjects of its Application want a *strong Figure* to make it due to them. And what is hard in his Lordship here, is making its greater Propriety to be the Food of our Souls, and coming so near to simple Diction, by obvious Analogy, an Objection to its being called so; and *that* a Reason against it, upon which our Church founds the Reason of the Name; *the strengthening and refreshing of our Souls, by the Body and Blood of Christ*, in like manner, *as our Bodies are by the Bread and Wine*; the Duty applies itself so closely to be the Food of our Souls, that it is *dangerous*, forsooth, to call it so; and the Church's Reason for the Name, is his Lordship's against it; *lest the Expression convey the Notion*, (which it ought to convey) of something *conveyed mechanically*, (an invidious Word thrown in) *or miraculously into the Soul*, or beyond the natural Virtue of Bread and Wine; and if that be the dangerous Notion with his Lordship, I hope as it always has, so it always will prevail with faithful Christians, to go to the Sacrament with full hope of having something conveyed to their Souls, to *their great and endless Comfort*, by such way as the divine Will pleases to effect it: *Somewhat to the Soul that is vital, what Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are the Emblems of; somewhat that is*
deri-
Q

derived to us, that raises our Faculties, and fortifies all our Powers, (B. Burnet's Art. 28.) The Fathers and early Writers I leave to stand their Ground against his Lordship, for deviating from the original Simplicity of their Religion, because they deviated from his Lordship's new Doctrine, by calling the Eucharist, not only Food, but Physick, Medicine for Immortality, Antidote against Sin and Death, &c. And the Words of the Church Catechism speak so strongly for themselves, viz. the strengthening and refreshing of our Souls, &c. against the new Sense his Lordship would put upon them, as wants no Assistance to clear them from it.

Bishop. *The same Mistake seems to lie in calling it the Renewal of the new Covenant on our Parts, and the Seal of it on God's Part; the former of which is a very improper Description of this Duty, as distinguished from all others; and the latter seems to me to have no Foundation in any Sense.*

REM. *The Mistake (if it be one) of the Lord's Supper being a Fœderal Act, and its improper Description, as such, is what both Divines and Churches are generally guilty of. Our Saviour himself calls it the new Covenant, or Testament, in his Blood; and if calling it a Seal have no Foundation in any Sense, our Divines are to answer for it, who without Scruple call it so, as a Thing out of Dispute. The Papists indeed, as his Lordship does, deny the Sacraments to be Seals, and 'tis a Point of Controversy between us, (Willet's Synops. p. 538.) But that the Sacraments are Seals, is the common Language, as well of our Divines, as of all Protestant Churches, so far as I know.*

Hammond Pract. Catech. *A mutual Confederation between us and a crucified Saviour on our Parts, an acknowledging him for our God, and worshipping of*

of him ; and on his Part, the making over to us all the Benefits of his Body and Blood, i. e. Death, Grace, Pardon, to sanctify and justify us.

Comber. Comp. to the Temple. *Seals of Love and of his Promises.* (Over and over again.)

And calling the Sacraments, *pignora, fœderis sigilla, gratiæ signa, gratiæ signaculum ; ἀσφαλισματα, obfignantia fidelibus promissam gratiam ; testera, &c.* is the Language of all sound Divines, as Names out of all Controversy due to them.

Gatak. Advers. *Sigilla fœderis*, Sacraments are the Seals of the Covenant.

Jun. and Tremel. *Testera efficax*, an effectual Pledge.

Beza. *Testera*, a Pledge.

Burnet's Art. *A Sacrament is an Institution of Christ, in which some material Thing is sanctified by the Use of some Form of Words, in and by which fœderal Acts do pass on both Sides.*

Church Art. 25. *They are sure Witnesses and effectual Signs of Grace, and God's good Will towards us.*

And this Name, without Foundation in any Sense, is the Voice of the Protestant World against that of his Lordship.

Bishop. *Neither does this Christian Rite to me appear to answer to any Rites or Ceremonies amongst the Jews or Heathens, which were properly fœderal.*

REM. The Passover was a fœderal Rite ; and that the Lord's Supper answers, and succeeds in its stead ; and that when Christ put an end to the old Passover he gave beginning to the new, or the holy Sacrament, is, I think, the universal Belief of Christians, who call it by its very Name, the Christian Passover ; which they give to the Festival commemorative of its Institution and original

Solemnization. And if his Lordship is right, the Christian World is wrong.

Bishop. *The Blood of the Sacrifices, which Moses called the Blood of the Covenant, the real Blood of Christ answers, and not the Wine in the Lord's Supper; and the Wine in the Lord's Supper is not the Blood of the new Covenant, but appointed to be drunk in Remembrance of the Blood of the new Covenant, — which makes it as different from that Blood, and from that Covenant, as the Memorial is from the thing remembered.*

REM. That the paschal Lamb represented Christ, called from it the Lamb of God; and that the real Blood of Christ answer'd the Blood of that Lamb, called the Blood of the Covenant, is undoubted; but how this is a Reason why the Sacrament does not answer the Passover as a foederal Rite, I do not apprehend; for one thing to answer another, is to be correspondent and agreeable to it, and of the like Nature: And this either with respect to each other, or with respect to some third thing, that in the same Manner they point to and regard. And thus the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper answers the Jewish Passover, not only in its general Nature, but through its particular Circumstances; they both pointed at Christ, the one prospectively, the other respectively; the Paschal Lamb represented Christ as a Type; the Bread and Wine more than typically represent him; the Blood of the Paschal Lamb represented Christ's Blood; the Wine in the Lord's Supper more than answerably does so in a higher Degree, and more real and true Manner, having by his own particular Imposition the Name given to it; which the Blood of the Paschal Lamb would then only have come up to, if Christ himself had said of it, as of the Wine, This Blood

Blood of the Lamb is my Blood *of the Testament, or in the Testament or Covenant.* And why does his Lordship stop at the Blood of the Paschal Lamb, and not pursue the resemblance and answerableness of the two Rites to each other, thro' all their particular Circumstances? As the Blood of their Paschal Lamb typified the Blood of Christ, so did its Body the Body of Christ, as the Bread in the Sacrament does in a more high and excellent Manner and Degree; as the Lamb's Flesh eaten was not only bodily, but spiritual Sustenance to them, so the sacramental Bread much more so to us; was Death annexed to the Neglect or Abuse of that, so is Damnation to this; as great Privileges and Advantages were believed to be annexed to the due Observance of that, and originally did attend it, so with much greater Reason must they be so to our Passover; and his Lordship allowing the Lord's Supper to succeed the Passover, and for that Reason not to be a *fæderal and covenanting Rite*, is the stranger; *because the Paschal Supper itself, he says, was instituted in Remembrance of the Deliverance of Israel out of Ægypt; and so the Lord's Supper was instituted for the Remembrance of the Deliverance of Christians by Christ; as therefore the Passover was a perpetual Memorial of the one Deliverance, so is the Lord's Supper of the other—and neither of them therefore can be esteemed the actual making those Covenants which are only remembered by them.*

The first Passover was instituted and celebrated before the Deliverance of *Israel* from *Ægypt*, so could not be wholly a Memorial of that Deliverance; because the Deliverance itself depended upon it as a covenanted Cause, that was to work it; the Blood of the Lamb being their appointed Security from Destruction, sprinkled on their

Lintels; and that, and the Observation of the other Circumstances of it, was the Covenant itself on their Side executed, the Seal and Condition of it; and as the first was not a Memorial, so each succeeding Passover was not a bare Memorial of their Deliverance, nor of the first, which itself was no Memorial; but was of the same Nature with the first; was the same Covenant still executed; the annual Observation being expressly included in the original Stipulation; and every following Passover was as much the Covenant, not remembered, but executed, as the first; following Passovers were not commemorative Sacrifices, but each as real and proper a Sacrifice as the first. It was not an absent Lamb remembered that was sacrificed in *Ægypt*, nor a figurative and representative one; but as true and real a one that was the Passover, as the first was; nor a Sacrifice of Memory, but Propitiatory, as the *Jews* believed in the highest Degree; nor does being commemorative hinder a Sacrifice from being also truly and really so. And if the Lord's Supper answers the Passover at all, it is a Covenant; and has Rewards or Punishments on God's Side, answering its Observance or Neglect on ours; is as the same *never* ceasing foederal Act, continued and going on, (*for the continual Remembrance*) by the *Lamb slain from the Beginning of the World*. If neither the original Patterns and Exemplars of the *Jewish* Passover or Christian Sacrament, as ordained and celebrated by the Institutor, could be a Memorial, neither can any Repetition be barely so; the Blood of the Paschal Lamb, his Lordship says, answer'd Christ's Blood as a Type that it respected as its Antitype, from which typical respect it derived that institutional Virtue and Efficacy by which it became a Protection from the destroying Angel;

Angel ; and the Cup in the Lord's Supper being more than a Type, a Representative expressly called by that Name, and appropriated to it by himself ; can it be supposed to come short of the legal Type of that Blood, in salutiferous Virtues and Effects conveyed through and by it ? Why must the Blood of Christ not yet shed, work back greater Salvation to the *Jews* through its Types in the Law, than when actually shed, it works forward under his Gospel, by that Cup dignified by himself with the Name, being not in Type and Shadow, but *verily* and *indeed* his Blood ? And since we see it is not naturally and substantially so, it must answer the Name and Character by being virtually and causally so, therefore, and *real* in its Effects annexed to the worthy Participation of it.

Bishop. *To speak of a particular Fellowship and Union with God, or with Angels and Archangels, as Privileges peculiarly implied or obtained in this Rite, is still, I fear, to lead the Minds of Christians still farther from its original Simplicity ; and to forget that the one of these things may be said of Obedience to God's Will in general, and the other of Praise and Thanksgiving in particular, more properly than of this Rite ; which peculiarly implies in it, our Union with Christ, and Fellowship considered as Head of his Body the Church.*

REM. This instead of adapting the Expressions and Language of our Church in her Office, is striking at them as *leading Christians from the original Simplicity of the Lord's Supper* ; not because the Expressions themselves are wrong, but as applied by the Church to the Lord's Supper, to which he would not have either *Union with God*, or praising God together with *Angels and Archangels*, &c. have any particular Relation, as Privileges

vileges any way proper to it; or otherwise than as in common to it with Acts of Obedience to God's Will, or Praise and Thanksgiving on any common Occasion.

And never certainly was a Christian Bishop before so afraid of God's Blessings, from the Discharge of this or any other Duty, lest they should come upon him beyond Expectation; or who so scrupulously warded against every Privilege or Benefit of any kind, from worthily receiving the Lord's Supper. He is afraid here, lest even speaking of *Union or Fellowship with Angels or Christ*, upon receiving the Sacrament, should be of dangerous consequence; and the lower Part of God's Family here on Earth, being encouraged to mix their Praises of him from whom the *whole Family in Heaven and Earth is named*, with those of the part above, upon this solemn Occasion, as attending this holy Supper, instituted by him who reconciled Heaven to Earth, should dangerously mislead us from the original Simplicity of the Duty; and that Praise and Thanksgiving ought to be forgot and left out here, only because it is applied to it as with greater Propriety and Peculiarity.

I am not, I confess, a competent Judge of his Lordship's Comparison between Communion with the exalted Spirits above, and Christ's meanest Members here below, so far as to know whether *we ought to be as proud of the latter, as of the former*; only Angels and Saints are generally thought to be the more honourable and desirable Acquaintance, *and singing the Song of and with Seraphs*, much better than any Correspondences with any on Earth.

Bishop. *Before I leave this Part of the Subject, I must observe, that the best of those Writers upon this Subject,*

Subject, who have taught, that by this Sacrament Men are entitled, if they be worthy Receivers, to the Benefits purchased by Christ's Death, &c. — seem to suspect this Doctrine to be uncertain and hazzardous, and therefore guard it with some such Restriction and Caution as this — Unless by any Viciousness in the Course of our Lives, we contradict the Professions of our solemn Devotions.

R E M. Is it any Argument that Men do not receive Grace, because they may receive it in vain? Must no Benefits or Favours be bestowed, because Men may abuse them afterwards, and incur a Forfeiture of them, and have them took from them, like the Talents not well employed? Do any Writers upon the Subject pretend that the Sacrament puts Men in such a confirmed and established Estate of Grace and Salvation, that they could not fall from it, and that the Grace of Perseverance attended those received from the Sacrament? May not Men be made whole, and if they sin more, have a worse Thing come unto them.

Bishop. *And lastly, to say that by this Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper worthily, we secure to ourselves God's Favour and Acceptance through Christ, unless by any Viciousness in the Course of our Lives we contradict the Professions of our solemn Devotions, seems no better than to give to this Act in one Part of this Sentence, a Privilege which is immediately taken away, by declaring in another Part of the same Sentence, the steady Practice of Virtue to be so necessary, that without it the Performance of this Duty worthily, will be of no avail towards this Acceptance.*

R E M. Was it of no avail for our Saviour to say thy Sins be forgiven thee, because the Pardon did not secure him from contracting more? Or is it of no avail to a Man fallen, to be set upon his Legs, because unless he take heed, he may fall a-

R

gain?

gain? Though the Benefits from the Sacrament reach also to the Prevention of that, to enable them *by Grace to stand*, to quicken and enliven, to strengthen and confirm every Grace and every virtuous Quality that was in them before, to infuse fresh spiritual Life and Vigor into the Souls of worthy Receivers, to weaken the Powers of Sin in them, to be a promoting Cause of every thing that is good, by which the Consequences of a godly and virtuous Life follow, as from a disposing Cause, by Influences secretly wrought by it. So that whilst his Lordship talks of the Necessity of *departing from Evil, practising all Virtue, &c.* he considers not, that this is the appointed Way and Means to do this; and to disengage Men from dwelling upon *supernatural Favours* and *exalted Privileges*, and to throw them entirely off from the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, upon a *Pelagian*, or worse Dependance, upon corrupted Nature, without Faith and without Sacraments, is not the Way to lead Men to those *practical Excellencies, which are the true Heights and exalted Accomplishments of the Christian Life*; if they were so (which they are not) that his Lordship so extols; which he that pretends to lead Men to, by any other way than by him that is *the Way and the Truth and the Life*, and by the Assistance of the divine Ordinances, talks more like an Infidel, than a Bishop or a Christian; which too fashionable Way of talking and thinking, far be it from his Lordship.

I do not understand why here at last his Lordship calls our Saviour *the Reviver of the purest Religion in the World*.

R E M. By *the purest Religion in the World revived by our Saviour*, his Lordship must mean what is now called the Christian Religion; which must once in some former Times have shone out in great Per-

Perfection ; but after that, was obscured, buried and lost, till our Saviour restored and brought it to light again in its pristine Purity.

Now the Christian Religion is the Christian Faith, of which Religion Christ, and the Articles relating to him, is the Foundation ; or as declared in Scripture, *the Preaching of Jesus Christ according to the Revelation of the Mystery which was kept secret since the World began ; but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the Prophets according to the Commandment of the everlasting God made known to all Nations for the Obedience of Faith.* And Christianity, is the Fellowship of the Mystery which from the Beginning of the World hath been hid in God, who created all Things by Jesus Christ ; or without Controversy the great Mystery of Godliness ; God manifest in the Flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the World, and received up into Glory. That Faith, and its End, the Salvation of our Souls, of which Salvation the Prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the Grace that should come unto (us) searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify — unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister the Things that are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the Gospel unto you, with the holy Ghost sent down from Heaven, which Things the Angels desire to look into.

If Christ was not the Author, but the Reviver only of this Religion ; his Lordship ought to shew us, when or in what Periods of Time, where and by what Persons, this Religion was professed before our Saviour ; or what other Religion, the purest in the World, it appears by Scripture, or any other History, our Saviour revived as before in being, and at his coming lost ;

and by what Name known or called by any Part of Mankind as a Religion.

If any other Man that wears the Livery of Christ, dignified with the *Insignia* of being one of the highest Officers in his Church, should talk of the *purest Religion in the World, which Christ is the Reviver of*, besides that *which in other Ages was not made known unto the Sons of Men*, (Eph. iii. 5.) and is now revealed;—I might think it was talking in the Infidel Strain of those who tell us of their *Christianity as old as the Creation*, and their *Religion of Nature*; but far be it from his Lordship, *washed and consecrated* as he has been, to wallow in the Mire with that Epicurean Herd; and far from me, if through Misapprehension of his Intention, my Thoughts would lead me wrong, as to say any thing unbecoming the Distance between his Lordship's high Station in the Church, and myself at the low Bottom of those who long have worn a Gown; not that I see why I may not *withstand any Man to the Face*, if he is to be *blamed*, in the regular way of my Independency; or why, *whereinsoever any Man is bold* against what I think the Truth, *I may not, I speak foolishly, be bold also*; having no Coercive, but a short Remnant of my Moth-eaten piece of Life to tempt me to *speak boldly, as I ought to speak*. (Eph. vi. 20.)

By the *purest Religion in the World, revived by Christ*, his Lordship cannot justly mean Morality or practical Religion called; because though our Saviour has indeed exalted and perfected those called moral Duties, yet he cannot be said to have revived them, unless they appear to have flourished in Perfection before; and unless they were buried and lost when our Saviour came into the World also; which is so far from being the Case, that

that Morality was never in greater Perfection than in the Centuries preceeding our Saviour's Nativity; insomuch that those who contend for its being Religion, pretend that there was no moral Duty which Christ taught, but was in equal height taught by some or other of the Philosophers.

Because Morality alone was never called, or thought to be Religion by any part of Mankind, since the Beginning of the World; and is no otherwise Religion in Christianity, than by positive Incorporation into the revealed System, and as standing on the Foundation of Faith, otherwise declared by our Church to have the *nature of Sin*.

And Lastly, because moral Virtues, though inseparable from religious Communities, yet are not essential to them as Religious, but as Societies, to the well-being, if not being, of which, they are indeed essential; but no less so to Societies of Thieves, Atheists and Devils, than to those of religious Persons. Amongst whom, the greatest Part of those *practical Excellencies and exalted Accomplishments of the Christian Life*, are found, without much Religion.

To shew how Doctors (in other Matters well agreed) differ, as to his Lordship's Doctrine, I shall conclude my Remarks with the Words of his Lordship's learned Predecessor, Bp. Burnet, no way suspected of thinking too highly of Rites and Ceremonies, opposed to his Lordship's Doctrine.

There are two Extremes to be avoided in this Matter, the one of the Church of Rome, &c. but the other Extreme that we likewise avoid, is that of sinking the Sacraments so low as to be mere Rites and Ceremonies.—The Phrase, the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, is above the Nature of an anniversary Memorial or Feast; this Opinion we think
is

6. 2. 96

is highly unsuitable to those high Expressions: and we do not doubt but Christ who instituted those Sacraments, does still accompany them with a particular Presence in them, and a Blessing upon them; so that we coming to them with Minds well prepared, with pure Affections and holy Resolutions, do certainly receive in and with them, particular Largeesses of the Favour and Bounty of God. They are not bare and naked Remembrances and Tokens, but are actuated and animated by a divine Blessing that attends upon them; this is what we believe on this Head, and these are the Grounds on which we found it.

F I N I S.



